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Explanatory Note

Since there were multiple partners involved in some of the projects presented, for ease of reference the partnerships are identified throughout this document by the applicant arts organization. Public school participants are listed on pages 9-12.

In the context of this document, Teachers refers to classroom teachers; Teaching Artists and Artists refers to people from the arts organizations who go into the schools and/or work with the teachers. With some exceptions, Staff generally refers to either the artistic or administrative staff of the arts organization. NEA stands for National Endowment for the Arts. PIE is the acronym for the Partners in Excellence initiative.

Although we have done our best to organize the information contained in these proceedings as logically as possible, to force a consistent format would have inaccurately portrayed the voices of the participants. In addition, our recorders and facilitators had a variety of styles that is also reflected in these pages.
MISSION
- To foster and promote broad access to high quality arts education designed to meet community needs.

PURPOSES
- To strengthen the capability of member organizations to achieve their missions.
- To identify and promote best practices.
- To bring together organizations and individuals to share experiences, ideas and information.
- To provide a national voice for community arts education

Founded in 1937, the National Guild is the service organization for a diverse, nationwide constituency of nearly 600 non-profit, community-based institutions which offer access to sequential arts instruction for people of all ages mostly after school and on weekends. Within this overall constituency 300 schools, operating in 44 states, are members of the Guild. The central mission of these schools is to provide high quality arts instruction in the visual, literary and performing arts to all persons, regardless of age, race, religion, aptitude or ability to pay.

Commitment to quality and open access for all is a core requirement of Guild membership as is the expectation that all students will be taught by qualified, practicing artists. Guild schools serve over 300,000 students through regular weekly instruction and tens of thousands more through other arts activities. Their annual aggregate budget is $105 million.

ACTIVITIES
The National Guild:
- **Certifies institutions** through a process of evaluation to ensure compliance with mission and standards.
- **Fosters the replication of successful models** through training, information, grantmaking and dissemination of best practices.
- **Strengthens the organizational capacity of member institutions** through training, technical assistance, mentoring and on-site consultancies.
- **Builds knowledgeable future leaders** through professional development opportunities at workshops and institutes.
- **Promotes communication and networking** through national and regional conferences, newsletters, resource materials and manuals, a website and an e-mail listserv.
- **Supports the creation and development of new schools** to foster greater access to quality arts education in underserved locations.
- **Informs and educates the public** about the value of community arts education through advocacy and public relations.

Special national initiatives this year include: **Partners in Excellence**, which fosters the replication of best practices in exemplary K-12 arts education partnerships and **Creative Communities**, a $4.65 million partnership with the **National Endowment for the Arts** and the **US Department of Housing and Urban Development** to support music and arts instruction programs for children and youth living in public housing.
PARTNERS IN EXCELLENCE INITIATIVE

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

*Partners in Excellence* grows out of the National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts’ longstanding commitment to providing leadership to the arts education community. In carrying out this initiative we will:

- endorse the concept of partnership as a viable arts education model
- continue to encourage community arts education organizations to develop partnerships with public schools
- respect the complementary nature of effective partnerships
- continue our commitment to quality arts education for all children and youth, in school and after school
- provide leadership in establishing or endorsing criteria which address issues of programmatic quality
- encourage partnership programs which address the national, state and local standards in arts education
- advocate the importance of curricula which include discrete, skills-based arts instruction and arts integration based on fundamentally shared processes in the arts and other disciplines
- support training and professional development for teachers and artists alike and team teaching wherever appropriate
- support diverse assessment techniques which measure teaching and learning against rigorous standards
- promote partnerships that expect to achieve enduring, positive changes in people, attitudes, values, systems and institutions
Introduction

Partners in Excellence is a national initiative which was developed to identify and study best practices in K-12 arts education partnerships and foster their replication. The project has evolved out of a continuum of inquiry by the National Guild about effective arts education collaborations, beginning with the formation of a special task force in 1990. This was followed by the Repro pilot project from 1992-1994, and the Linkages with Public Schools symposium supported by the Annenberg Foundation in 1996. The recommendations made to the Guild at that symposium were:

a) to undertake a national study to examine the “pathology” of success  
b) to identify program models by defining their specific components  
c) to develop a set of guiding practices to assist all partners

Three years later a new task force was convened to advise the Guild on the development of a national initiative to strengthen arts education partnerships. The set of guiding principles developed by that panel (and reproduced on the facing page) forms the philosophical basis for Partners in Excellence. This project has been made possible through a major grant from the Josephine Bay Paul and C. Michael Paul Foundation.

When completed, the project will consist of four parts: the national conference; publication and dissemination of the conference proceedings; a training institute for program directors, key staff and administrators at community schools of the arts and other arts organizations; and publication of a partnership guidebook.

To launch the initiative in April 2000, the Guild notified a broad cross-section of arts organizations nationally about the program and subsequently issued Requests for Proposals to nearly 300 potential applicants. Applicants were asked to focus not only on their accomplishments but also on their challenges and problem-solving strategies. Out of 55 proposals received from 21 states and Canada, 15 were selected through a panel process to speak at the conference. In making its choices, the panel looked for a record of progressive development, promising practices and strategies for sustainability along one or more of the following dimensions:

1. The Ecology inherent in the partnership  
2. The Quality of Teaching and Learning among students, teachers and artists  
3. Professional Development for teachers and artists  
4. Program Evaluation and Assessment of student learning

The panel found that while many collaborative relationships do exist, they often take the form of so-called “service provider” models, in which the arts organizations offer a roster of services, sometimes “tailored” to the schools’ needs, and the public schools purchase programs, usually lessons. While these arrangements are not without merit, they lack the opportunity to take joint advantage of the expertise of both the arts and education communities to create in-depth, pedagogically sound arts experiences for children, and professional enrichment for both teachers and artists. In such situations, true “buy-in” from the schools, and particularly from the teachers, tends to be minimal.

The Guild staff and advisors were determined that the PIE conference go beyond simple show-and-tell presentations in order to examine the inner workings of what makes these partnerships tick. It was a demanding but exciting exercise as our hard-working facilitators pushed the presenters to deconstruct their partnerships. We all emerged exhausted and even, sometimes, frustrated. However, we believe that some very important ideas and issues were uncovered. We hope you will agree.

Lolita Mayadas  
Executive Director
Conference Reflections

The Partners in Excellence conference took place on January 19th and 20th, 2001 at the historic Riverside Church, with magnificent bird’s-eye views of the Hudson River that were, unfortunately, obscured by rain, snow and fog. We were pleased that approximately 90 people attended all or part of the conference.

While recognizing that these partnerships represented exemplary alliances, the primary purpose of the conference was to explore the processes that make them so and discuss strategies for sustainability. We also learned about the long term impact on the culture of each institutional partner, about best or most promising practices in professional development, about what constitutes exemplary teaching and learning, and about techniques as well as issues related to evaluation and assessment. We are grateful to the conference presenters, for not only providing us all with insights into their work, but for having the courage to be candid.

In endeavoring to have an in-depth look at both the benefits and liabilities of such relationships, we spent a great deal of time wrestling with structure and content issues. We did not want to have a series of papers presented, nor did we want a keynote speaker; rather, we tried to construct a dialogue that would be built around specific questions posed by our facilitators to panels of presenters. It was not always easy, for either presenters or facilitators, to move away from “best foot forward” mode. In consequence, changes in approach occurred even between the first and second days of the conference, as a result of people’s suggestions and our own observations. Some of this is reflected in the proceedings, which, as you will see, do not follow a consistent format. We were, however, pleased with the outcome: all this poking and prodding elicited much information that is of value to the field.

A summary of the conference highlights begins on the next page. The entire proceedings were recorded primarily for documentation purposes and may be better used as a reference than read from cover to cover. They will also serve as a resource if, for example, you wish to investigate a specific area.

A word about “ecology,” which we used to describe something that goes beyond mere structure to a point of interdependence: as a flower produces pollen, from which a bee makes honey that humans consume even as they appreciate the beauty of the garden, an ecological partnership, to our minds, is a community of interacting children, teachers, artists, parents, funders and, frequently, the neighborhood in which they exist. Like any ecosystem, it must have a context. It was gratifying to hear that by the first day’s wrap-up, several conferees were comfortably discussing the ecology of their partnerships as well.

The PIE Conference could not have happened without the wisdom and efforts of our advisory committee — Chairperson David Myers, Jane Remer, Ronne Hartfield, Larry Scripp and Andrea Temkin — and of our supplementary panelists, Russell Granet and Kathy Tosolini. The four conference facilitators — Sarah Jencks, Arlene Jordan, Richard Kessler and Margaret Salvante-McCann — performed admirably in the face of a daunting task; they were truly extraordinary and dedicated in their determination to elicit the information we needed. The recorders, Dawn Ellis, Ronne Hartfield, Sara Goldhawk, Duffie Adelson and Gary Margolis, took on a difficult task with enthusiastic devotion. To them I would add Amy Chase Gulden, who was kind enough to share her own notes with me. Speaking personally, I must thank the entire Guild staff, especially Associate Director Jonathan Herman, my own wonderful partner for this project, and Program Associate Anne Mironchik, our invaluable logistics and details person.

Finally, all of us at the National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts owe an extra debt of gratitude to David Myers and Jane Remer, who were not only advisors but mentors, “em-cees”, hand-holders, song-leaders and all-around cheerleaders who made us do our best.

Still ahead are the training institute and publication of a partnership guidebook, both of which will be based on the tenets taught and learned at this conference.

Jacqueline S. Guttman
Project Director, PIE
Highlights and Insights

While separate, sometimes artificial, “compartments” were created in order to organize the conference
process, in extracting the highlights they must be reintegrated, as they are overlapping and interrelated – an
ecosystem, as it were.

The big question is, what is it about these partnerships that has enhanced and enriched the quality of
teaching and learning? And what effect has this kind of teaching and learning had on professional
development, program evaluation and assessment of student learning? For if they have not enriched them,
what is the point?

Extracting from the proceedings the most relevant insights regarding strategies for sustainability and significant
impact on the partnering organizations was challenging, not because they were difficult to sift out, but because
they were so extensive. After numerous readings, however, a number of recurring themes emerged:

Time is a motif throughout the proceedings, in such contexts as planning time, reflection
time, time to build relationships, enough time, release time, being paid for time,
sacrificing time and so on. One person commented that a 3-year NEA grant had given them
time to develop and refine a program; another observed that 3 years is not long enough – that
it takes more like 10 years before a real comfort level has evolved and the partnership is not
dependent on the presence of specific individuals.

Sustainability of the partnership was an area where panelists cited several concerns and
strategies, among them:

Buy-in, on the part of teachers and administrators, was an area of vast learning for the arts
organizations. In general, these partnerships have dealt with that issue, but every time there
is staff turnover in the schools, ways have to be found to assimilate new teachers into the
arts culture. Panelists discussed issues of “intrusion vs. inclusion” and self-selection vs. a
whole school approach.

Trust was mentioned frequently, as a partnership simply will not thrive in a non-trusting
atmosphere. Teachers and artists must trust one another; children and teachers need to
have a sense of trust to feel safe enough to take creative risks. As one artist put it, “[Trust]
is about building a relationship with the strangers who come into the house”; another said,
“Trust is the basis for a ‘safe space.’”

Shared Expectations is a related issue that arose during both the ecology and the evaluation
and assessment sessions. In the case of the latter session, this referred specifically to the
need for program staff and evaluators to begin the assessment process with an agreement
as to what should be evaluated and the potential uses of the information acquired.

Funding, or its lack, was cited frequently. Among the funding strategies suggested was that
partners apply for support collaboratively, and that funders look at supporting the partnership
itself, rather than one of the component organizations. Related to this “umbrella” approach
was the importance of developing a partnership structure and mission which supercedes a
mere understanding of one another’s respective missions. This approach also included a
recommendation for having “dedicated” staff – those whose job is exclusively about making
the partnership work.

Advocacy and the necessity for it at all levels, mentioned in this context referred to the need
for strong superintendents and executive directors, the importance of engaging support from
local and national government agencies, and the ability to demonstrate to an arts board the
relevance of an educational partnership.
Food was another recurring sustainability theme. Giving teachers, artists and administrators opportunities to “break bread”, rather than just working together, was a major ingredient in relationship building.

Parental Involvement was the challenge most frequently cited after funding. Although the schools and arts organizations share this goal, most are having limited success. One organization’s series of Family Arts Nights is proving somewhat fruitful, as is another’s internship program. More thinking and experimentation are required in this area.

School Community: Asked what they would do differently were they to begin again, two arts in education organizations responded similarly: they would “hang out at the school”, looking and listening “more closely in order to really seek out and identify the resources from within the school community.”

Keeping The Students at the center was expressed in many ways at many sessions, especially regarding professional development. Rather than being concerned about the politics of who plays which role or possesses greater expertise, the act of jointly setting goals for student learning and figuring out how those goals will be met serves as one of the highest forms of professional development, well past the idea of who trains whom.

University Involvement, while not endemic to every one of these partnerships, must be considered when constructing them. University partners bring an additional perspective, offer possibilities for pre-service as well as in-service training, and serve as a research/assessment resource.

Impact of the partnerships probably evoked the most touching comments. Suffice it to say here that both the arts organizations and the schools learned to “walk in each others’ shoes.” The impact indicators were profound and lasting. We heard about children who view orchestra members as “their” musicians; about an orchestra’s pointedly engaging players with a variety of ethnic backgrounds; about divorcing education from audience-building; about teens who were once hostile to neighboring Lincoln Center now working there as interns; about schools’ embracing a vastly broader approach to learning; about music teachers being put on staff for the first time; about schools functioning as museums; and about resistance, moving to acceptance, and, finally, to recognition. This kind of impact has led to sustainable partnerships in which attitudes have been deeply, positively and permanently affected on both the institutional and individual level. The happy outcome is that artists, children, educators and parents are thriving on arts learning. And that, more than anything else, answers the question of “What is the point?”
The Partnerships

While these fifteen partnerships are very different from one another, their common denominator is a commitment to artistic and educational excellence, mutual respect and shared responsibility. They also share a commitment to the concept of creating together. Indeed, as was pointed out several times during the conference, the act of collaborative planning became, in and of itself, professional development in the highest sense of the word.

Some of these partnerships have existed for a decade or more while others are pilot projects. They involve arts education organizations, community arts schools, performing organizations, arts centers and even a juvenile probation department. Some can be defined as partnership agents, coordinating the activities of disparate collaborators. All have one or more public schools as partners. The partnerships involve anywhere from two to six institutions and 25 to 23,000 students. Budgets vary widely.

The review panel placed special emphasis on those elements it deemed critical to a partnership among equals. They include shared goals, values, and decision-making regarding both structural and curriculum issues; equitable distribution of financial responsibility, resources and leadership roles; evidence of existing problem-solving strategies; and changes made in response to evaluation and assessment processes.

We are grateful to them all for their dedication and for their frankness, but most particularly for the passion they bring to their work. As a society, and as professionals who know the impact the arts can have on our children, we are in their debt. The partnerships are listed below with notations referring to the “dimensions” which reflected their greatest strengths and the focus for their various presentations. Abbreviations for these dimensions are:

\[\begin{align*}
EP &= \text{Ecology of the Partnership} \\
PD &= \text{Professional Development} \\
T&L &= \text{Teaching and Learning} \\
E&A &= \text{Evaluation and Assessment}
\end{align*}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ArtsConnection</strong></td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1980’s</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Elementary School (CES) 53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A long-term, in-depth program that is a model of collaborative planning and professional development for artists, teachers and administrators alike. [EP, PD, T&amp;L, E&amp;A; Panels: 3, 5, 8, 13]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Cleveland Orchestra</strong></td>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Ireland/Lafayette Contemporary Academy, Roosevelt Elementary, Rozelle Elementary William Cullen Bryant Elementary Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A relatively new undertaking that responded to a need, moved beyond the original idea of “what would work”, and developed very strong connections among the orchestra, the musicians and the community. [EP, PD; Panels: 4, 6]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Elaine Kaufman Cultural Center (Lucy Moses School for Music and Dance)

Manhattan School for Children

A high quality model of a public school/community arts school collaboration that could be replicated in many communities. [EP, T&L; Panels: 3, 11]

### Fitton Center for Creative Arts/SPECTRA+®

Harrison Elementary, Adams Elementary, Van Buren Elementary Schools, Miami University of Ohio

An arts integration project with a strong research component and an unusual genesis as part of a community plan. [PD, E&A; Panels: 5, 14]

### Institute For Arts and Humanities Education

Paul Robeson Theme School for the Arts

An all-around high-quality and continually evolving arts integration program that has shown a particular sensitivity to the needs of the school and community on all levels. [EP, PD, E&A; Panels: 3, 7, 12]

### Las Vegas Artist in Residence Collaborative

Las Vegas City and West Las Vegas Schools, Las Vegas Arts Council, New Mexico Arts

A program that has engaged area artists who use the local culture to help teach about global issues and who also serve as role models. [EP; Panel #1]

### Maui Arts & Cultural Center

Department of Education - Maui District, Haiku School

Modeled on the Kennedy Center’s educational partnerships program, the program has been adapted to the specific educational needs and geographical limitations of a remote island in the Pacific Ocean. [EP; Panel #1]

### New York City Opera

Martin Luther King, Jr. High School

A program that dramatically changed the students’ and teachers’ relationships with neighboring Lincoln Center and demonstrated that children, teachers and parents can be captivated by opera. [EP, T&L, E&A; Panels: 4, 9, 13]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Enrollment, Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The New York Philharmonic</strong></td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2400, 2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 165,108, 59, 199 171, Dual Language Middle School (Manhattan), PS 19, PS 84 (Queens), PS 39 (Brooklyn), CS 61 (Bronx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An established, well-focused program and a good example of a multi-faceted relationship that also involves community schools of the arts. [EP, PD, T&amp;L; Panels: 4, 6, 11]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Carolina Dance Theatre</strong></td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3000, 6-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte-Mecklenberg Schools Curriculum Department, Northwest School of the Arts, Northridge Middle School, University of NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capturing Creativity, a project which researches the creative choreographic process and, from the information gained, is developing innovative approaches to teaching in the schools. [EP, T&amp;L, E&amp;A; Panels: 2, 9, 14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul Robeson and Diego Rivera Academy</strong></td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>25, 6-8 + families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Workshop, San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department, Department of Human Services, Department of Mental Health-Child Crisis, SF Unified School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pilot project involving young offenders in an intensive art-integrated and arts discipline-based program. [EP, T&amp;L; Panels: 1, 8]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studio in a School</strong></td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>537, 2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 213, Queens (Carl Ullman Elementary School)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of several innovative Studio programs in which a teaching artist works in an on-site studio and serves as a consultant and resource throughout the year, truly immersing the school and its students in art. [T&amp;L; Panel 10]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trident Regional Arts Collaborative Endeavor (TRACE)</strong></td>
<td>Moncks Corner, SC</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3500, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley County, Charleston County and Dorchester Two School Districts, Charleston Symphony Orchestra, Gibbes Museum of Art, Charleston Ballet Theater, Charleston Stage Company, Spoleto Festival, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An agent for artistic and educational development, not only for the schools served, but for the several arts organizations involved in this project. [EP; Panel 2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>City, State</td>
<td>Founded</td>
<td>Enrollment, Grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tucson Arts Connections</strong></td>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>8400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Unified School District,UA Presents*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A well-balanced partnership that has allowed classroom teachers to enhance their ability to teach through the arts, while developing a broader audience base for UA Presents Schooltime Matinees. [EP, PD; Panels: 2, 7] * The performing arts series of the University of Arizona.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young Audiences/New York</strong></td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>211, ages 14.9-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn School for Career Development (BSCD), a.k.a. P753K (special needs population)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A video and technology based project for neurologically and emotionally impaired high school students which helps prepare them for a role in the workplace. [T&amp;L, E&amp;A; Panel 10, 12]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule of Panel Sessions

ECOLOGY OF THE PARTNERSHIP - January 19 Morning

Panel #1
Las Vegas Artist in Residence Collaborative, Ribera, NM
Maui Arts and Cultural Center, Maui, HI
Paul Robeson and Diego Rivera Academy, San Francisco, CA

Panel #2
North Carolina Dance Theatre, Charlotte, NC
Trident Regional Arts Collaborative Endeavor (TRACE), Moncks Corner, SC
Tucson Arts Connections, Tucson, AZ

Panel #3
ArtsConnection, New York, NY
Institute for Arts and Humanities Education, New Brunswick, NJ
Elaine Kaufman Cultural Center, New York, NY

Panel #4
Cleveland Orchestra, Cleveland, OH
New York City Opera, New York, NY
New York Philharmonic, New York, NY

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - January 19 Afternoon

Panel #5
Fitton Center for Creative Arts, Hamilton, OH
ArtsConnection, New York, NY

Panel #6
Cleveland Orchestra, Cleveland, OH
New York Philharmonic, New York, NY

Panel #7
Institute for Arts and Humanities Education, New Brunswick, NJ
Tucson Arts Connections, Tucson, AZ
QUALITY OF TEACHING AND LEARNING - January 20 Morning

Panel #8 Page 45
Paul Robeson and Diego Rivera Academy, San Francisco, CA
ArtsConnection, New York, NY

Panel #9 Page 47
North Carolina Dance Theatre, Charlotte, NC
New York City Opera, New York, NY

Panel #10 Page 49
Young Audiences/New York, New York, NY
Studio in a School, New York, NY

Panel #11 Page 52
New York Philharmonic, New York, NY
Elaine Kaufman Cultural Center, New York, NY

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT
AND EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEARNING - January 20 Afternoon

Panel #12 Page 55
Institute for Arts and Humanities Education, New Brunswick, NJ
Young Audiences/New York, New York, NY

Panel #13 Page 57
New York City Opera, New York, NY
ArtsConnection, New York, NY

Panel #14 Page 59
Fitton Center for Creative Arts, Hamilton, OH
North Carolina Dance Theatre, Charlotte, NC
Effective partnerships connect with both the unique resources and unique needs of their communities (or environmental contexts) to build organizational relationships that improve the climate for arts learning. These interactions among the people and the institutions that commit themselves to a common vision for arts education may appropriately be said to define the ecology of a partnership.

— David Myers
Ecology of the Partnership – January 19 Morning Session

After leading the gathering in, appropriately, a partner song, David Myers laid the foundation for the first series of panel sessions and spoke about the Partners in Excellence conference overall. In defining ecological partnerships, he said they might be thought of as “a dynamic and evolving society of individuals and institutions, each of whom brings unique agendas, resources, perspectives, and assumptions to the task of finding common ground in [their] work.”

Continuing, he said, “The environmental contexts that affect partnerships may be geographic, cultural, economic, or historical. They may be arts-rich or arts-poor; they may have strong schools or weak schools; they may have activist communities or underserved segments of the population or disinterested constituents; there may be strong cultural and ethnic identities or a lack of role models; new ideas may be welcome or resisted; there may be available funding or few resources. Effective partnerships connect with both the unique resources and unique needs of their communities (or environmental contexts) to build organizational relationships that improve the climate for arts learning. These interactions among the people and the institutions that commit themselves to a common vision for arts education may appropriately be said to define the ecology of a partnership.”

Speaking about the conference, Myers said its purpose is to “build on the ‘known’ in arts education partnerships to identify promising practices that translate into principles for other contexts (or ecologies). Every partnership is unique, but ever-effective partnership draws on practices that are universal, applicable, and adaptable for a variety of partnership ecosystems. PIE was designed to raise the level of discourse about arts education partnerships. In the area of ecology, we approached this task by articulating the following guiding questions:

“What are the factors that contribute to a sustained partnership effort?”

This question gets at issues of how the vision of a classroom teacher or a lone music or art teacher struggling to provide arts education gives way to a broad-scale effort that involves community arts resources and personnel in arts learning for children. How does such a partnership become institutionalized or embedded in a community — how does it become part of the systematic work of schools or arts organizations, including line-item funding? How can organizational structures withstand changes in leadership or funding, and how are the commitments of partnering institutions maintained? How is the need for leadership balanced with mutuality and consensus, and how is long-range planning accomplished? These and other questions lie at the heart of how a partnership ecosystem functions for maintaining high standards of arts education.

“What changes have occurred in partnering organizations as a result of your partnership?”

If a partnership is to survive, everyone has to gain something. What are the institutional changes that have occurred, such as hiring an education director in an arts organization, or securing commitments of a board, or developing a school liaison task force for arts education? Have there been changes of attitude? Do artists within an organization get service credit for professional development? Have constituents moved from an “audience” to a “participant” mode? The challenge to participants is to derive principles for effective practice out of their own experiences, offering guidelines for the development of strong partnerships in their own communities.”

Following Myers’ introduction, different groups of panelists were asked to give a brief overview of their partnerships, in four simultaneous sessions, followed by their observations regarding the institutional impact on each of the partners and strategies for sustainability. Small group “breakouts” of 4-6 people explored some of the points that had been made. The panel sessions concluded with discussions of the two main partnering issues: impact and sustainability The panel session findings were reported by the facilitators at a wrap-up plenary session.
Las Vegas Artist in Residence Collaborative (LVAIR)
Janet Stein-Romero, Project Director

Stein-Romero: LVAIR was founded as a partnership between the Las Vegas and West Las Vegas Schools, New Mexico Arts and the Las Vegas Arts Council to bring both native and contemporary arts into the schools in a region in northern New Mexico that is isolated from large metropolitan areas and resources. The Collaborative has developed a heritage program that involves students, parents and the school superintendent. Among the accomplishments of which they are most proud is a *retablo* project using Renaissance techniques. Funding from the local community has been strong and sustained with the greatest support coming from the local schools. The Collaborative works primarily with the local arts council, and sometimes with the state arts agency. LVAIR has had to face many obstacles, including very frequent turnover among key staff (of 89 school districts in the area, 80 get new superintendents each year); district rivalries going back to 1860 that hamper collaborative efforts; geographic and travel issues (the school districts are separated by a river and bad roads on which the six artists must drive as much as 75 miles); and artists who were initially unaccustomed to dealing with students. Also, paychecks are often delayed because of the state bureaucracy, which can be very difficult for the artists. The population is 80% Chicano Hispanic; the remainder are Anglos with a few Native Americans. As the artists are also Chicano, they have been able to use their shared heritage and traditions as an entrée and basis for addressing contemporary issues that focus on both the local and global. While the artists do receive training, Stein-Romero would like to see better orientation for the schools.

*Impact on the Partners*
- With a lot of staff turnover at the schools, it has often been the LVAIR artists who have provided stability and rolemodels for the students
- Some of the artists who were initially fearful of the students have helped create a coherent community and also become advocates for such things as bilingual education

Maui Arts and Cultural Center (MACC)
Susana Browne, Education Director

Browne: The partnership with the Maui School District is designed to integrate the arts across the curriculum. The islands that comprise Hawaii are linked by a single school system of which Honolulu (located on Oahu) is the center. In 1994, a new cultural center was constructed on Maui with a 5000 sq. ft amphitheater. Even before the center was completed, teachers were invited to discuss their needs and student art was exhibited. In 1995 the Center and the Department of Education, Maui District, became the only team from Hawaii to participate in the Kennedy Center Program, *Performing Arts Centers and Schools: Partners in Education*. There are no arts specialists in the schools. As a participant in the Kennedy Center program, MACC has utilized it to its advantage despite limited arts resources due to their remote location. As Maui’s geography creates inaccessibility (it is surrounded by water), local involvement was crucial to the program. The program trains teachers to integrate the arts into the curriculum through 12-14 workshops annually in which local and national speakers address the teachers. The governing structure includes two Center partners and two education partners; the partnership principals sign agreements with MACC. All teachers are invited to attend the workshops; word spreads through word of mouth. Funding has been provided through the Goals 2000 initiative and cultural center grants.

*Impact on the Partners*
- Browne was not sure if the organizations have changed significantly. However, through the professional development workshops, national arts education standards are now beginning to be implemented in the schools.
Paul Robeson and Diego Rivera Academy – Tom DeCaigny, Program Manager; Nancy Yalon, Project Manager; Julie Sperling, Arts Integrated Academic Instructor

DeCaigny/Sperling: The partnership is part of the Repeat Offender Prevention Project of the California State Board of Corrections. The Academy’s goals include the design and implementation of individual strategies for student improvement in arts integrated academics. Dance, drama and visual art are also taught as unique disciplines. The focus is on technique and virtuosity as well as thematically linked projects. The partnership was set up as a collaborative program of five agencies (Probation Department, mental health and human services agencies, schools) and the Performing Arts Workshop. All the kids in the school are on probation. They benefit from the fact that they get a lot of attention during the school day and that a safe environment for discussion has been created. The artistic discipline has been important for undisciplined kids. One challenge has been the high level of staff and department turnover, in part because the artists were not originally prepared. Staff training has helped. Structurally, advisory board representatives were selected by each of the organizations, allowing for network-building and “decompression” in an atmosphere of neutrality. Core funding has come from the city.

Impact on the Partners

• The partnership has resulted in better sharing of information among city agencies as well as between city agencies and the non-profit community. As a result, Performing Arts Workshop, a small, non-profit organization, has learned to better understand the city bureaucracy and has also been granted the opportunity to advocate for arts education within both the traditional education and juvenile probation settings.

Panel 1’s Strategies for Sustainability

1. Tap into local and national resources
2. Engage local artists; using local artists in the schools can be beneficial to all the partners.
3. Invest in training for artists and teachers
   - Encourage team teaching, for arts achievement and education achievement
   - Provide time and financial compensation
   - More is not necessarily better [focus on core artists]
   - Make it job embedded – during the work day
   - Work with the willing
   - Vary the models, with opportunities to use them; follow-up is key
4. Foster equality in partnerships
   - Create win-win situations
   - Serve each others’ needs
   - Maintain individual identity
   - Conduct a needs assessment
   - Make it easy for the school to participate
   - Set clear goals and responsibilities
   - Create effective marketing materials; tell the story effectively
5. Develop communication networks and systems between the education and arts communities
6. Engage the personal involvement of all players
   - Find artists who are personally involved in sharing their heritage with students
   - Pay them well
   - Provide training and orientation at all levels: consistent, on-site, with debriefing; value feedback
   - Prepare students for what to expect
Panel 2 – Sarah Jencks, Facilitator

North Carolina Dance Theatre (NCDT) – Alain Charron, Director of Education
University of North Carolina at Charlotte – Pamela Sofras, Associate Professor of Dance

Charron: “Capturing Creativity” is a research project that includes the 23 certified dance instructors of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, the University of North Carolina at Charlotte’s dance education program, the Northwest School of the Arts and the Northridge Middle School. It explores and defines the creative process in dance by documenting the creation of new works and analyzing the artist’s process. There is a unique situation in Charlotte because the school district, 5th largest in the nation, has a dance teacher in every school. The project is based on the North Carolina Arts Standards with an emphasis on the creative process. The documentation enables teachers to examine the choreographic process in terms of looking at problems and seeing how they are overcome. Supported by North Carolina’s Cultural Education Collaborative, they have created lesson plans for teachers. UNC-Charlotte’s dance education department has the opportunity to work with NCDT as they train teachers. Now they are looking at the choreography of dancers as well as [dance] students, and comparing them in developing lesson plans. The relationship of the school district and dance company includes having a district representative on the board of NCDT; the teachers also serve as evaluators and give feedback to the dance company about their educational materials.

Impact on the Partners

COMPANY

• NCDT is using its partners in the community to provide an opportunity for educational research into the creative process, something that they haven’t had before
• This is the first time the repertoire of the dance company has been used as the basis for educational activities
• Corporate funders are supporting educational activities

SCHOOLS/UNIVERSITY

• They have had success in getting it acknowledged that the university dance program as well as the school dance teachers are artists, whereas previously the dance teachers had always been considered physical education teachers
• While it had been a struggle for the university to get NEA funds for the dance education program because they were not an arts organization; they are now having better success, apparently because of recognition of this project
• The university staff is able to take a leave of absence of one year to work full time on the partnership
• For the teachers, it is new to have a professional development opportunity outside of the school district
• The eighth grade has a required field trip in dance

Trident Regional Arts Collaborative Endeavor (TRACE)

Meryl Weber, Art Coordinator, Berkeley County Schools; Terry Ritchen, Project Director

Weber/Ritchen: A partnership between three school districts and five arts organizations including the Gibbes Museum of Art and Spoleto Festival USA offers professional development opportunities for art, music and classroom teachers to integrate the arts into the third grade curriculum, opportunities for students and teachers to personally experience the arts, and access to teacher-developed, arts-infused thematic units. The TRACE program is very focused on school change and, to that end, emphasizes staff development. It started in 1993 with an NEA grant, beginning with 15 schools in 3 districts. Now 23 schools are involved, totaling 3500 third-graders. Additional arts partners have been added over the years. The organizers feel that they have had
success because it’s not an add-on for the classroom teachers but a help to them. They have become successful mostly through word-of-mouth: the teachers in the original three districts talked to one another about it.

Impact on the Partners

- The arts organizations and the school districts now share in the development of the actual curriculum and standards
- The arts organizations are developing education programs which they did not have before
- Critical thinking skills will be a heavy focus at the art museum, which will enhance the overall school curriculum
- The arts partners rallied round to help support the partnership when federal education funds were lost so that the teachers would not be hurt by the negative impact
- The museum partner has used the statistics of working with a large number of students to get new and more funding

Tucson Arts Connections (TAC) – Dr. Joan Ashcraft, Assistant Director
UA Presents, University of Arizona – Benita Silvyn, Education Director

Ashcraft/Silvyn: TAC is a collaborative project between the Tucson Unified School District Fine Arts Department and UA Presents, the presenting organization for the University of Arizona. The goal is the integration of the arts into general classroom activities. The project offers in-depth opportunities for students and teachers to connect with relevancy to the programming provided by the presenter and infuses arts into the curriculum. The presenter’s Schooltime Matinee series (K-12) is linked to local teacher-artists working with the schools. A part of the program is a weeklong Fine Arts Summer Institute (FASI) for about 180 teachers at which nationally known educators give workshops. Teachers receive graduate credit, which motivates them to attend. In addition, the teaching artists offer in-service opportunities for teachers, including a teacher’s guide, and the university develops student materials. While any school/teacher can attend performances, teachers in the program are required to attend the in-service courses.

The program is based on the State Arts Standards and includes a Principals’ Forum that was modeled after the Kennedy Center program for principals. Last year the principals brainstormed in a planning process about what they need regarding the arts education. It was run by UA Presents rather than the school district. The principals were treated as professionals and were able to network, see special evening performances, make site visits to other schools, and meet over lunch and dinner. The new school superintendent has attended the forums as well.

Impact on the Partners

ARTS ORGANIZATION

- Had the opportunity to present the principals with new research regarding the role of the arts in overall learning
- An expanded Schooltime Matinee series is building a broader audience and greater recognition of the arts

SCHOOLS

- The budget has been increased for more arts teachers
**TAC’s Strategies for Sustainability**

1. Base the partnership on a recognized need; a needs assessment is a good idea
2. Know the partner’s mission and develop a mission for the partnership itself
3. Distribute the leadership; nurture an adaptable culture
4. Try to involve a university inquiry from the beginning, perhaps with pre-service training
5. Be knowledgeable about state mandates/politics but look beyond them to needs and changes in the field
6. Develop structures for:
   - Planning on the classroom and institutional level
   - Communication
   - Staff and professional development
   - Financial options
7. Plan and manage growth – start small and grow slowly
8. Designate “dedicated” staff who have the partnership as their top priority

---

**Panel 3 – Arlene Jordan, Facilitator**

**ArtsConnection (AC) – Carol Morgan, Deputy Director for Programs**

**Elementary Teachers Network (ETM) – Barbara Batton, Co-Director**

**CES 53 – Susan Cermansky, Instructional Leader**

*Morgan/Cermansky:* ArtsConnection’s collaboration with CES 53 goes back to the late 1980’s. With funding from the National Endowment for the Arts and the New York City Board of Education’s Project ARTS, the partnership was deepened. The result, Thematic Arts Seasons, includes semester-long multidisciplinary series of thematically related arts activities with an instructional sequence and materials targeted to specific grades. Each child receives 10 sessions each in theater and dance. The project also reaches 100 teachers, some of whom are still resistant (usually the more recently engaged). Isolation is everywhere. The artists and teachers don’t talk to each other; also, the artists don’t get to talk to each other and the teachers don’t talk to each other. The partnership is still in formation and is now “really getting good”; even thought it’s been in existence a long time. AC is a “dedicated” arts in education organization, which is different from having an arts only mission where education is not the primary reason for being. Morgan’s own mission is about how to create a culture of learning, i.e. “how do we learn how to ask questions.” This is essential for them. The program costs $260,000 annually, half of which is met by the school through Project Arts and the other half through city and state funds and funds raised by ArtsConnection.

“CES 53 is a very specific place with its own ecology.” The school is in the South Bronx. 100% of the kids receive free lunch; they are all Latino and African American; “it’s a very powerful place.”

*Batton:* They’ve been there for nine years, having originally come in to do a literacy assessment. They have moved from looking at literacy to a much broader look at learning. (See Teaching/Learning and Evaluation/Assessment sections.) The work has deepened: they are now looking at artist clips of work.

**Impact on the Partners**

- *Morgan:* We as an organization have learned a tremendous amount about schools, about assessing students, about how to be better partners
- *Batton:* The school has been undergoing change. It has been an interesting switch; whereas the principal was good at management, he is now [also] good at being an educator
Q: How might you do it differently if you were starting again?
AC didn’t know how rich the possibilities were at the school at the beginning, so they “were busy going around like Johnny Appleseed spreading seeds. We would look and listen more closely in order to really seek out and identify the resources from within the school community. We haven’t yet engaged parents and families in the process – family events are not well attended – so we have more work to do.”

They have had difficulty with shared power. All meetings are facilitated. “[Y]ou need to have structures that help both points of view. Artists are not always good listeners – we are very good at shouting but not necessarily doing the listening.” One of the challenges: building such programs in schools requires a new set of skills, but some of the staff are really stepping up to the plate.

AC’s Sustainability Issues

• **Communication**

AC schedules monthly team meetings that include their staff, the principal and teachers. Now they are having substantive conversations; they are asking specific questions, and not just about teacher buy-in, although that’s a continuing question.

• **Planning**

Coordinating takes a bunch of time and energy and is ongoing. AC struggles with how you get teachers and instructional leaders in a school to value the arts – to see what it is that arts bring in and of themselves. AC has a person in the school to coordinate and to build in lots of time for communication and planning; there are three 45-minute meetings between artist and teacher for every 10-session residency, dealing with planning, mid-review and final reflection. It’s also about listening.

• **Developing Support**

Building a community of artists and teachers has to come from within the culture of school itself. Both artists and teachers are asked to be reflective practitioners; to understand the expertise that teachers and artists each bring to table; to understand the resistance by “getting into the other persons’ shoes. You are on their turf, [where] the culture is focused on test scores [and] the pressure on the teachers is huge and real. Find the common ground, i.e. discuss and bring together the educational and artistic goals.” This year, AC asked, “What skills and strategies do your kids need to have to do well on those tests?” AC makes the link to the teachers through the arts. Using the idea that the arts are about the improvement of other subjects is problematic: that’s not about the arts.

AC’s Sustainability Strategies

1. Become part of the life of the school; meet them on their own territory; create spaces for public discussion at the school
2. Have lots of conversations, share ideas, question your assumptions
3. Build trust. It allows experimentation, which is essential at all levels to both establish and sustain a partnership
4. Build space for risk-taking and experimentation
5. Build in time; focus on evolution (They’ve taken 10 years)
6. Learn how to make knowledge together – how to describe and observe the work in process. This helps them find ways to assess it and to find the common ground. “This all takes an enormous amount of time, but the payoff is incredibly worthwhile; the learning has been reciprocal.”

*Batton* (the evaluator): “She reaches out to the paraprofessionals and parents, too. They have started to involve more and more people in looking closely at their work. They have made a place where something new
is being created. Elementary Teachers Network has been important for moving beyond compartmentalization, for looking at the whole child and seeing that a child is more than the sum of his test scores. “It’s a relief from the test driven culture, so keep your eye on the prize.”

**Institute for Arts and Humanities Education (IAHE)** – Dr. Rina Shere, Executive Director

**Paul Robeson Theme School for the Arts** –

Maureen Heffernan, Artistic Director, Charles Collins, Principal

**Shere:** A partnership with the Paul Robeson Theme School for the Arts expanded when, in 1998, the school became a theme school for the arts, where the arts are the cornerstone of learning, i.e. curriculum, instruction, and assessment are all transformed through the arts. Artists conduct year-round residencies; teachers and administrators attend professional development workshops and summer institutes. Artists and teachers work as teams.

**Q: What would you do differently?**

**Shere:** Hang out more at the school, like a social scientist”; find ways to get the parents involved in the school. It is a challenge to get parents engaged in their own artistic experiences. IAHE has started a program with very intensive training of teacher/artist teams, which offer an evening series of four Standards-based arts lessons for families. Providing food helps make the parents feel welcome. Parents have a fun experience and develop a different relationship with the teachers; it’s also an opportunity to have them work with a professional artist, to see what an artist is like, and to understand the learning that happens and why the school supports this approach.

**Heffernan:** The idea of getting to know people well is that they can begin to draw on each other’s strengths and meet each other’s challenges. Over time the teachers have moved to a comfort level with the artists, who [they know] will not make them feel silly or show off. The teacher can say, ‘those instructions weren’t clear” – “my kids needed 5 steps.’ At first, people don’t want to challenge you because you are the guest visitor.” Now they have developed the give and take of what is needed to make it more effective, which is important. “The people at Paul Robeson are willing to go on adventures; sometimes we’ll fail and we’ll fail together.”

**Q: What about building trust—why do you have to work so hard to build trust.?**

**(Participant):** People are afraid – that teachers coming into the school may cause them to lose their jobs.

**Shere/Heffernan:** Because teachers are overworked – have test score worries – it takes a long time to develop what they want to do together. The artists pride themselves on their free spirit. It’s as simple as we don’t know each other – I don’t know your vocabulary, personnel, style. The education system is not a culture of trust, which is true for cultural organizations as well. We send out artists to do things – accountability is scary – and they feel they are swimming upstream. Trust [in this partnership] is happening more quickly because of the [three-year] track record. It’s about building a relationship...with the strangers who come into the house; even the students have those problems – the students are hesitant about giving their best. [Building a relationship] makes a big difference. One artist has evolved into a ‘big brother’ – he can now get the world out of them.

**Collins (principal):** The school community and the professionals wanted [the theme school] – they loved the idea of becoming an arts theme school rather than a performing arts school. For example, the year of the Oklahoma bombing, many distraught kids needed closure. Together with Rina and Maureen, we devised an interesting concept, to nurture the children by working with them at all grades and levels to fashion a ceremony focusing on **Ritual** and the Arts and **Healing** and the Arts. After the ceremony a tree was planted. It effectively brought that era and tragedy to closure. The monument [tree] is still there. IAHE and its vision helped showed how the arts can translate and transfer any given experience into another [form]. We [now] need ongoing documentation; going into individual classrooms during release time to actually develop programs to try out; saying it’s OK to talk about what didn’t work. The next step is to share the successes and challenges of each individual project—sometimes with the artist or teacher looking on—so there [will be] a risk-making culture, which is why we became an arts school. Celebrate success.
Challenges: The budget is under $20,000; the school has 500 kids, pre-K through 8; there are 40 staff members; it is located in downtown New Brunswick. Parents often have two jobs and are not available. They are looking at the administration and levels of teachers and parents, how all of them are interfacing with the students, and at the way the arts are used in schools.

**IAHE’s Sustainability Issues**

- **COMMUNICATION**
  
  It leads to relationship building, which leads to shared goals and values, which leads to changes slowly in the culture of school. It’s about learning how the school works, getting “into the skin” of the teacher, “hanging out” at the school working with the teacher. [IAHE has] focused a lot on teacher professional development. There has been an organizational shift as well in the way they view and talk to teachers.

- **TIME**
  
  The 3-year NEA funding was helpful in that they began to look at the school as a learning laboratory, develop residency themes that tie into the curriculum, and to look at how the arts and humanities work in the system.

---

**Elaine Kaufman Cultural Center (EKCC), Lucy Moses School for Music and Dance** – Sean Hartley, Director of the Theater Wing and Coordinator of the Residency Program

**Manhattan School for Children** – Claudine Jellison, Coordinator of Arts Programs

_Hartley_: The Manhattan School approached the EKCC’s Lucy Moses School for Music and Dance to see if they could do something to help strengthen their program. MSC had little dance and art among own staff and needed them to fill a mutually recognized gap. The partnership was designed to develop a comprehensive _Arts for Literacy_ program, a sequential approach to skills accumulation which is coordinated with the academic curriculum. The partnership is partially supported by Annenberg funds. The program started with a skills-based music program for a semester. As a result of its success, the school was able to secure funding for a larger presence involving drama. The first year, teachers chose from a pre-existing menu of drama activities that EKCC had created such as improvisation and theater games, that could be tailored to support the curriculum needs. The second year, EKCC went to each teacher and asked, ‘What are you doing this year? What are your goals and how can we help you?’ which was much more successful. The partners teamed to meet their agenda, e.g. science and drama, and a program was custom-made for each teacher. “Right away the classroom teachers were buying into it.”

**Impact on the Partners**

- Moving from extrinsic to intrinsic motivation to participate. Kids have begged to participate in their free time; the artists and teachers do not have to try to motivate them anymore because they want it on their own.

- The school population has changed because the program attracts parents and children who are interested in this arts-rich approach. Also, with a more visible arts presence, they attract parents who are involved in the arts.

- Traditions have been established: Curriculum pieces have been developed and are returned to year after year. In each grade kids look forward to certain projects; they are part of the school culture and are in the school calendar.
The program has been fun for the children as well as providing opportunities to learn in different ways:

Illustration: A 4th grade teacher wanted the children to understand colonial America and had an idea whereby each child in class would research a character and bring the research to class. The drama teacher had the children act out their characters. The classroom teachers in the school added more skills to the teaching while the teaching artist added new [levels of] understanding. In accommodating many more ways to learn they have reached many more children.

Jellison: Where you have staff that’s been there for 2–3 years you have people with [an arts] frame of mind who have new tools that they did not have before. They now have some curriculum pieces that have been developed that children look forward to, e.g. ‘when I get to 4th grade I get to become a colonist in Plymouth.’ Music has [also] become part of the school language. The school also has people on staff who came from the arts as professionals, who can translate for both artists and teachers who don’t understand each other.

Q: Why was there a lack of trust?
The teachers felt they had so much to cover that a guest artist coming in and doing art would take time away from what they needed to do. Sometimes a teacher-artist comes across as a “know it all”, but since they have started inventing together, they are really partners in the classroom.

Panel 3’s Summary of the Overall Impact on the Various Partners

• Arts organizations learned the importance of
  a. Listening
  b. Documentation (evaluating programs, assessing student work)
  c. Relationship-building
  d. Taking time to create knowledge together and describe works in progress

• Schools found that
  a. New ways to learn are accommodated
  b. Families are brought closer to the school and each other
  c. Each others’ strengths are recognized
  d. Concepts of learning are expanded
  e. Principals “buy-in” to inquiry-based learning
  f. Embracing partnerships leads to growth
  g. Usual structures change: grade meetings, teacher/artist study groups
  h. Promising practices are shared

Panel 3’s Portable Practices or Strategies

1. Build effective relationships
   - Build trust, support, credibility—relationships that are based on shared goals and values
   - Start small—build at the grassroots level – a “contagion model” – over time. The mantra of the arts organization should be, “What skills/knowledge do students need to do well on tests?”
   - Create processes that will enable and structure communication. Build in time to meet – with principals also; include time for planning and reflection
   - Allow time for: professional development, family involvement, grade conferences, coaching days
   - Become part of the life of the school
   - Ask more of people; understand and respect the expertise of both teachers and artists
- Facilitate planning meetings between teachers and artists to keep shared goals in focus and to challenge their thinking. One teacher noted that planning can get very practical; an outside program person can help remind both parties of the possibilities and the overarching goals. Have instructional leaders on each grade to guide these meetings based on their observations in the classrooms.

- Break bread: have informal lunches with artists and teachers.

- Have study groups of faculty – teachers and artists.

- Put an arts person on the scheduling team, who will advocate for the length and kinds of time needed to plan and teach in the arts.

- The process of partnership-building is an evolution of expectations. [Enter into them knowing] it will evolve.

2. Utilize artists as consultants, with flextime, and provide teachers with coverage.

3. Coaching/mentoring: create coaching days, when teachers can stop by and talk to the artists during the residency to support their in-class plans and stretch their abilities to incorporate the arts and take risks within the art form in their own classroom. This creates and supports more teacher responsibility/ownership. When the artist is there as a consultant it is a good use of both budget and time. Create a culture where there is freedom to fail.

4. Model [practices] at all levels; encourage people to challenge their assumptions, experiment, take risks.

5. Longevity – try to keep the same artists.

6. Keep everyone on the same page: communicate to the school community via newsletters to remind everyone about scheduling, including coverage. This keeps everyone in the loop, those directly involved and those who are supporting the involvement of others (especially the people providing the coverage and having their schedules shifted to accommodate the work).

7. Build school/community traditions.

- Create a place in the school culture, events or activities that are anticipated and expected by students, teachers and parents alike.

- Display artwork: “school as museum”

- Create spaces for public discussion.

*On What They Would Do Differently*

**ARTS ORGANIZATIONS**

a. Appreciate the richness available in schools.

b. Spend more informal time in schools.

**SCHOOLS AND ARTS ORGANIZATIONS**

a. Increase parental involvement.

“It takes years of mulling and ruminating...to find out what we need to know; time and relationships are so important.” It was mentioned that when the Annenberg initiative had to come up with the two most important words about partnerships, they were *time* and *communication.*
Panel 4 – Richard Kessler, Facilitator

Cleveland Orchestra – Amy McClellan, Manager, School and Community Partnerships; Joan Katz Napoli, Director of Educational Programs

Roosevelt Elementary School – Jay Keefer, Principal

Learning Through Music (LTM) is a partnership with four Cleveland-area elementary schools that is designed to support general learning in the classroom through the use of music and musical concepts. The orchestra felt compelled to respond to an educational crisis in the city, and [therefore] had to approach the partnership from the schools’ standpoint. Whereas initially they thought they knew what was needed (based on discussions with representatives from the school community), they found after the first year that they needed to make substantive changes, shifting the focus to where the child is in the classroom. An unanticipated side benefit has been the relationships that have developed between the orchestra musicians and the students and teachers.

Impact on the Partners

**Orchestra**

- The musicians were very interested in participating - management had assumed there would be no interest!
- The musicians involved in LTM feel better about their jobs and are excited about finding effective ways to engage children. The orchestra has provided [professional] development opportunities
- Board, staff and musicians have been brought together in ways not seen before. This has developed internal partnerships within the orchestra

**Schools**

- The students and faculty view the orchestra musicians as “their” musicians
- A full-time music teacher was hired for the first time as a result of the partnership

**CO’s Sustainability Strategies**

1. Build in mechanisms for sustainability within each institution
2. The teachers must take on roles related to the management of the project

New York City Opera (NYCO) – Paul L. King, Director of Education

Martin Luther King, Jr. High School (MLK) – Maureen Nobile, Arts Access Director

The City Opera is in its eighth year of a partnership with Martin Luther King, Jr. High School that is designed to integrate opera into student learning through interdisciplinary, school-to-work and performance activities. Located across the street from Lincoln Center, the school had historically viewed it as an elitist institution. Through the partnership, they developed an interdisciplinary approach to opera in the classroom that interweaves Social Studies, English and Opera. Even though they now have an archive of lessons available for use, each residency has turned out to be planned by the teacher and artist from the ground up. Last year the partnership included 17 residencies in team-taught English and Global Studies classes, 5 advanced mini-residencies, a school-wide production of Act II of Scott Joplin’s *Treemonisha* and 30 intern and shadow placements. The program has grown from 1 to 22 residencies, plus a one-month summer program, and a co-produced opera.
Impact on the Partners

SCHOOL

• The schools are adapting to more “business-like” procedures
• The students, faculty and their families have had significant exposure to opera

NYCO

• They have been learning to think about arts education beyond enrichment
• They have had to learn to be flexible and adapt to a school climate, which includes finding adaptable artists
• The Opera’s corporate identity is changing to reflect the diversity among the project’s stakeholders, who are predominantly African-American
• Audiences have gained respect for the kids, who are well-prepared
• The program has expanded to meet the needs and interests of both the school and the opera
• Kids never used to come to Lincoln Center; now they come on their own and use it as a resource

NYCO’s Sustainability Strategies

1. The opera board established an education committee
2. Staff development was done jointly for artists and teachers
3. Co-production of the opera brought together both teachers and parents
4. They had a tribute to the school principal at the opera
5. MLK started a steering committee that works with NYCO
6. MLK asked a member from NYCO to sit on their community board
7. They have incentives in place:
   - Participating students are eligible for internships at Lincoln Center
   - Participating teachers are offered free tickets
   - Lesson plans are published on-line; teachers are paid for them
8. Teachers are allowed to self-select and not forced to participate

New York Philharmonic – Thomas Cabaniss, Director of Education
P.S. 213 – Elaine Shapiro, 5th Grade Teacher

Cabaniss: “The School Partnership Program is an intensive initiative that serves the New York City Public Schools. It includes ongoing in-school instruction by professional musicians, professional development for the classroom teachers and the musicians, workshops for parents and opportunities for selected students to study instruments at nearby community music schools. The musicians who work in the school are drawn from local conservatory graduates who have an interest in education. The orchestra musicians function as guests, not regular teaching artists. One issue is that, while the 10-member teaching faculty is great, the orchestra musicians are not very involved. Also, the orchestra is set up to give concerts; education programs are an adjunct—not central. The challenge is how to make education a central part of the orchestra’s mission. These projects take time; 3 years is not a meaningful [enough] number of years. The partners must be committed to many years to really institute change—“be committed for the long haul.” Another challenge: even though funding for the program is secured, we have to ensure that the impact is as important to the orchestra as it is to the school. Currently, it is more important to the school.
Impact on the Partners

School
a. One year a recorder fanfare was created for the kids to play at 5th grade graduation. Now it has become a school tradition. Each year the kids look forward to composing and performing it.
b. While the school was initially unconvinced [of the program’s value] at the outset, after 6 years they [now believe] that this can work.
c. Part-time music specialists were hired by the school and are now a line item in the school budget.

Orchestra
a. The orchestra performed pieces that had been composed by 3rd and 4th graders; this made the partnership come alive for the musicians.
b. “It’s thrilling to see concert halls filled with diverse students.” (Hillary Easton comment)

NYP’s Sustainability Strategy
The choice of project leader: although the orchestra has a 10-member artist faculty, they chose as a leader someone whose priority and experience would ensure the sustainability and success of the project.

Notes On A Small Group Conversation (Excerpts):
Hillary Easton (NY Philharmonic evaluator), Shalondra Henry (Arthur M. Blank Family Foundation), Paul King (NYC Opera), Amy McClellan (Cleveland Orchestra)

• On the Goals/Mission of the Partnership
  a. Asking questions is important in order to refine the vision
  b. Make sure the educational goals correlate to the mission; it’s not realistic to try to change the mission, but the organization must acknowledge the important of education. This must be reflected in everything the arts organization does.
  c. It must be demonstrated to the board and leadership of the arts organization how the educational component supports the mission of the organization and is [also] audience development.

Q. What is the difference between education and outreach programs?
King: City Opera doesn’t differentiate. They must engage kids who’ve had no arts exposure by using different methods.

• On the Nature of Partnerships
  Easton: Partnerships between teachers and artists are a big issue. Constant dialogue is needed; they need to develop a common task.
  King: Teachers should be paid to participate for all the extra time and planning; this is key.
  McClellan: Cleveland has not paid teachers yet for staff development.

  King: Try to shift funding so that the schools pay for more; currently, the arts organization pays for most of it. Funders should fund the partnership rather than funding the arts organization or school.
  Easton: An unwillingness to change fundamentally inhibits true partnership; the balance is tilted toward the arts organization. Flexibility is very important.
  McClellan: Lack of diversity in the orchestra is a problem with the schools, so the orchestra is engaging more diverse guest artists to work with the schools.
  King: We need to come at partnerships as more co-equals, starting with funding and the needs of organizations.
Easton: A truly co-equal partnership would look very different in terms of the agenda – it’s too tilted toward the arts organizations now.

King: Assess the needs of the students. [Ask] “What is the intersection between the schools and the arts organization?” You must be flexible.

King: One key school contact is essential for sustainability.

McClellan: The school coordinator must be given authority, if it’s not the principal.

**Q: What happens when some teachers aren’t interested?**

King: Work with the teachers who buy in and the program will grow incrementally. Also, start where you’re strongest.

**Q: Can you change teachers who aren’t interested?**

King: Yes – but it’s best to work with those who are interested and pull the others in through staff development.

McClellan: A whole-school model [can develop] as projects mature [but] new personnel come in who haven’t been involved in the past. This is a challenge. [Cleveland’s] program used to be school-wide; they are now giving the teachers a choice – and everyone signed on. The teacher must want it.

King: There must be a statement of commitment from the school. Also, you must reach a critical mass of supportive teachers – then it dominates.

- **On Key Benchmarks of Change**
  
  Easton: Teachers partner with one another in new ways and children partner with one another in new ways.

  McClellan: Schools begin to accept the corporate model of “best practices.”

- **On Parent Involvement**

  McClellan: Parents are invited all the time but usually don’t come.

  King: The issue of parent impact is very challenging.

  Easton: [The NY Philharmonic has an] extensive parent/child program, but its impact is still not known.

  King: Internship programs draw parents in more.

Kessler pointed out some common threads of the presentations and discussions:

- Engaging collaboratively in the creation of art is central to these partnerships.
- A structure must be put in place.
- It is crucial to take a long-term view of the project.
- Asking questions all the time is essential.

**Panel 4’s Summary of Impact Indicators and Measures of Success**

**Arts Organization**

- Change at all levels of the organization, i.e. placing education on a higher level of importance/understanding
- The audience’s diversity changes both the arts organization and the community
- A more diverse set of artists is engaged
SCHOOL

- Teachers make sacrifices; give their time to the program
- Teacher interest is used to “grow” the program
- Self-directed involvement increases
- Arts specialists are hired
- Teachers partner with each other
- Schools embrace “best practices”
- Parent participation is at a high level

ARTS ORGANIZATION AND SCHOOL

- Student-centered education is kept at the center
- The Partnership does not depend on (i.e. will survive turnover by) key personnel
- Arts become a meeting ground for the partnership
- Programs grow in scope and depth
- New jointly-built structures of support get created

Promising Practices For Sustainability

1. Education is divorced from “audience building”
2. Intrusion vs. inclusion
3. Self-selection vs. whole school
4. Schools and districts provide incentives, e.g. release time
5. The different environments are analyzed/respected
We are trying to get at promising practices; the idea is to change how the creative process is taught and tie it more closely to choreography. The project debunks the whole idea that there are not problems to be solved in the creation of a dance work.

— Alain Charron
David Myers opened the afternoon Plenary Session with an introduction to the issues relating to Professional Development for Teachers and Artists.

“The purpose of professional development programs is to encourage, model, and support the highest possible quality of teaching and learning in classrooms. There are two primary aims for professional development for artists and teachers in partnerships:

1. Ensuring that arts learning experiences have artistic worth and value
2. Matching the learning tasks and the instruction to the developmental traits of the learners

“To satisfy these aims requires many supportive tasks, such as choosing appropriate materials, planning and sequencing instruction, modeling arts experience, engaging students, establishing relationships with other disciplines, and inspiring satisfying performances. In partnerships, an important dimension of professional development is clarifying the roles of artists and teachers and helping them learn to operate as a team within classrooms. Though many professional development programs emphasize packaged strategies “guaranteed” to work, with artists teaching teachers and the separation of content and process, arts education requires models of professional development that reflect the inherent qualities of arts learning experiences. Time and resources are often limited, offering significant challenges. Artists may have little background working with children, or limited knowledge of school environments and cultures. Teachers may never have worked with practicing artists, and there may be unrealistic expectations of classroom teachers’ abilities to implement the arts or artists’ abilities to implement instructional activities.

“To do creative professional development, like any creative activity, leaders must think outside the traditional boundaries.

1. How can professional development provide simulations and models of collaborative classroom practice between artists and teachers?
2. How can the arts specialist, classroom teacher, and artist be empowered to work from their individual strengths?
3. How can professional development be structured to provide ongoing observation, feedback, and training for artists and teachers?
4. What support structures can enable problem solving and transfer, rather than the mere mimicking of activities from workshops?
5. How can pre-service training of artists and teachers connect with needs in professional development?
6. How can we assess the effectiveness and application of PD programs?

“These and other questions provide the framework for using the professional development experiences of represented partnerships to provide guidelines for evolving partnerships. Focusing on issues and principles, the task of the participants is to assist others by extracting the principles of professional development that can be useful to anyone in the field.”

Before breaking the plenary group into panel sessions, Myers challenged them to consider these two questions:

Q: What do people learn in professional development?
Q: What is transferable?
Panel 5 – Margaret Salvante-McCann, Facilitator

Salvante-McCann began by asking the panelists to tell their “story”, especially focusing on any “transformational moments.”

Fitton Center for Creative Arts – Rick H. Jones, Executive Director
SPECTRA+® – Jackie Quay, Director
Miami University – Dr. Richard Luftig, Researcher

A partnership with the Hamilton City Schools and Miami University that grew out of a community planning process, SPECTRA+’s goal is to assist schools in transforming their culture so that the arts are incorporated as a basic part of the daily curriculum. In nearly 10 years, the partnership has survived many personnel and budgetary changes.

Quay: The program requires that the teachers receive training in Multiple Intelligences (MI), which SPECTRA+ provides. We make no assumptions about previous knowledge of educators. If we want them to understand the philosophy of Multiple Intelligence or project-based learning then we provide the training to them. Bruce Campbell, an author of the MI Handbook and other books, is our authority on MI in the classroom. He gives an annual 2-day refresher course for new and older faculty. The artists are happy to be included; they work with the researchers, using the arts specialists and classroom teachers as deliverers. A classroom teacher who values arts in education models what it looks like to set up a MI classroom.

Professional development beyond these areas is ongoing and voluntary. We offer multiple opportunities for teachers to learn new ways to integrate the arts into the classroom as well as workshops on specific art forms, such as ceramics or making musical instruments, so teachers can build their skill levels and experiment with incorporating the arts into their own teaching. We do an interest survey with teachers to determine topics for professional development outside of the ‘sacred cows.’ Because we respond to what the teachers want, we do not need to recruit them. They come because they are interested.

SPECTRA+ offers whole day Saturday workshops, summer weeklong Institutes (Arts Camp for Educators), and midweek evening arts seminars. Educators can earn a Master of Education degree with a concentration in the Fine Arts through an agreement with the University of Rio Grande. They have found that summers and weekends are the best time to “capture the audience”, who receive stipends and college credit. Quay also teaches professional management strategies, helping the artists learn behavior management and negotiating with the district.

Another facet of professional development is provided to school personnel by incoming artists-in-residence. They always include some introduction to the art form in a hands-on or active way for the teachers, usually on-site and after school.

The last level of professional development involves what the classroom teacher does when the teaching artist or artist in residence is working with the children. Classroom teachers are encouraged to actively participate. While this, too, is voluntary, if they are not actively engaged with the children and artists, they are “journaling” what is going on in their room. They instituted this to provide a reference for teachers to use after the artist leaves or when the teacher wants to reinforce the concepts the teaching artist has taught and, also, to keep them from doing other things such as grading papers. “I often ask teachers ‘What is the message you are sending and values are you projecting to your children when you are not paying attention either in a concert setting with visiting artists or with teaching artists or residencies? Would you accept not paying attention from your students? What behaviors are you modeling?’

CHALLENGE: There is a money issue; funds are not available so they will not be able to get Bruce Campbell back until next summer. However, he does look over the planned unit so they know that it is appropriate.
Salvante-McCann: We don’t have clear universal ideas of arts teaching practices, (but it might be on the next day’s agenda.)

Luftig: I think we know what the best teaching practices are. The [real] question might be the degree of congruence, whether what you are doing connects with best teaching practices. In special education classes, for example, ask what’s going on in the arts classroom that works, and particularly why those things work.

Q: Can you think about an artist in your program who has come into the school fully equipped and able to do a residency?

Quay: Michael Kenwood Lippert is our teaching artist for drama. He’s an actor who knows how to work with children. The teachers and principal follow the Ohio Arts Council Arts in Education Guidelines, which are important and very helpful. Michael incorporated and worked with these guidelines.

Q: What kind of support system does he have?

Quay: Michael did not require any special training from me because he is an experienced teaching artist with lots of previous training. He also has an instinct [for this work]; the classroom teachers do stay with him as a form of their professional development. He is the artist in residence in the classroom. He stresses discipline with dignity and building cultural competency, while addressing the needs of certain populations in the classroom.” When an unproven or unknown teaching artist wants to be employed in a SPECTRA+ school, s/he must go through specific training concerning, e.g. curriculum development and the school culture.” The Fitton Center serves as the external support system as well as performance assessor. Quay uses the guidelines for successful residencies compiled by the Ohio Arts Council as a resource for training. Also, they do peer training in which an experienced, successful teaching artist will train a novice. They stress best teaching practices as identified by Robert Marzano.

ArtsConnection (AC) – Carol Morgan, Deputy Director for Programs
Elementary Teachers Network – Barbara Batton, Co-Director
Community Elementary School 53 – Susan Cermansky, Instructional Leader

Morgan discussed the use of videotape as a professional development tool. AC taped an artist leading the kids. He found it useful to see where his teaching worked – a way to reflect on his teaching practices. Morgan herself has seen the tape several times and is increasingly convinced that it becomes a training experience when artists observe a video of their own teaching.

Q: What was the artist gaining in his teaching practice?

Morgan: [After watching the tape] the artist himself had questions about what he was doing. You can’t think about it in the moment because you’re too busy doing it. The taping provides an opportunity for self-reflection and self-evaluation; the artist becomes a reflective practitioner in education [not just art]. And not only is he reflecting, he’s reflecting on his own criteria. [The tape is] a tool that you can discuss; it’s concrete. The artists also were able to observe the students, to look at how they responded.

The ArtsConnection staff has also shown the videotape to the project team, as she and the artists described what they were seeing. “There were things [the artist] knew — he was very polished – but there [also] were places he gave up control and allowed others to jump in [with comments].” The next step is to show it to students and teachers.

This videotape technique was compared to North Carolina Dance Theatre, where they usually have peer reviews of their teaching. As peer review is very threatening, this [self-review] is a non-threatening way in which they can work through [the lesson] and make comments.

Q: Can you describe how artists and teachers develop relationships?

Morgan: Through the planning and reflection process. Each class has two 10-week residencies, one in theater...
and one in dance. We do professional development with the artist and teachers on different days. For every 10-session residency there are [also] 2-3 reflection meetings with the artists and teacher together to examine the goals they had set and talk about what the kids are learning. We have taken it a step further, to team teaching in a particular classroom; that has been particularly effective.

There was a description of Rhetumba (an African dancer). The dancer brought a percussion instrument to the planning meeting. The project included the study of Langston Hughes' poetry. During the evaluation, the artist noted that they had learned a particular dance form while learning the poetry alongside. The groups of children were able to develop the poetry using the drum and other percussion instruments. [The evolution was] interesting since the teacher had not been very involved at first. “She had come to me, saying, ‘what good is it, it doesn’t teach them how to pass tests.’ This was a bilingual class at a whole bunch of different levels. She saw [how the arts could be used] and let go of her objections to having the arts. The artist collaborated in creating an environment so that the artist and teacher could have that conversation. [Such opportunities] must be built in, so that they can happen.

Q: What’s promising about it?
Quay: In a 2-way conversation, both parties understand each other’s goals and are learning to do things in a different way. That’s primary to our planning.

Q: How does one facilitate a planning session?
“When SPECTRA+ facilitates a planning session in the school, we work with a grade level. We provide art, music, dance, and drama. We map the big picture, e.g. what will happen this quarter, what will happen in the next couple of weeks, where can we fit things in. We look at all models in all disciplines, e.g. if you are going to teach math, ‘what might we do in that school in dance; maybe we can make it thematic.’ It depends on how sophisticated a site is – if it’s a “mature” site [that is, accustomed to SPECTRA+].”

Q: How does the planning play out?
“[Interestingly] the most successful site may not be the most mature. The more mature a site becomes, the more we are pressured to let it go because of economic constraints. If we don’t have a facilitator there every single week, the school may backslide, and then you run back over and nurture some more.”

Q: What’s promising about it?
Morgan: Residencies [that] build in release time for teachers during prep time. We find coverage to release the teachers during the school day. The artists always get paid [for professional development]. Schools have made accommodations by building in extra time during the day.

Q: How do you set up a relationship where teachers get professional development credit?
Morgan: ArtsConnection offers after-school on-site credit; The culture was already there to set aside time for practice; the principal supports this by having weekly grade meetings.

Q: What made it work?
1. Time
2. Shared vision
3. Shared goals
4. Buy-in by administrator, principals, teachers
5. Leadership and expertise; the liaisons are professionals who coordinate everything
6. Savvy fundraisers
7. College connection

Morgan: Historically, the ArtsConnection staff and these teachers have gone to regional professional development centers; they always had ongoing workshops and institutes — you name it. They connect to professional development [in general]; it’s not just about arts education. The idea of play and work, the element of art [that relates to] how the space is being used, what are the values... these lead to a much greater collaborative network.

Participant: Professional development content is about making sure you can recognize your own strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.
Salvante-McCann asked the small breakouts to invent some promising professional development practices and illustrate them with “stories of what works.” Some of the practices that emerged from the stories follow:

• **BREAKOUT A**
  a. Student, parent, teacher, artist involvement
  b. Sufficient and appropriate space, with food; compensation is provided
  c. A field trip
  d. Diversification of roles
  e. Lines of communication and trust lead to a good working relationship
  f. Practice teaching
  g. A focus on internal gratification
  h. Ideas and best practices are shared
  i. A real sense of ownership is developed
  j. Supplementary resources are provided
  k. Teaching artist models for the teacher; practice in the presence of teaching artists
  l. Outcome: the teaching artists and teachers start to understand each others’ roles; you have better trained teaching artists and better trained teachers.

• **BREAKOUT B**
  a. The teachers and artists agreed up front to focus on real arts experiences
  b. A story was built on shared memories: they recalled that they had had time in a retreat location to get to know each other and get over the initial hurdles
  c. A task was presented: create a multi-disciplinary arts piece
  d. A science teacher suggested a project
  e. Conversation, excitement were generated; an atmosphere where ideas could bounce off each other
  f. Artists and teachers developed the project together.
  g. The teachers worked hard on the principal to get her to use professional development days for the planning of team teaching projects. An important part of that planning was about active listening and brain skills; they developed the ability to talk to each other in a better way Summer institutes helped, but took years to get off the round (there is always resistance to new things)
  h. Child care and cell phones can be provided for people who need them
  i. A stipend is paid
  j. A (student) researcher is provided
  k. Peer to peer mentoring exists, e.g. a classroom teacher worked with the principal to have the 5th grade teachers meet together to pass along knowledge
  l. Facilitator, partner, mentor, and coach visit regularly
  m. The ecology of the partnership is used in the “game” of looking at professional development

• **BREAKOUT C**
  a. The partners meet: 3 to 4 classroom teachers work in teams.
  b. The dynamics of teaching artists working with teachers is important, e.g. a dance residency started with movement warm-up. Then they moved on to thinking about the idea of dance
  c. “Homework”: they developed these ideas to share at the next meeting
  d. Goals & possibilities are clarified at the second meeting; the “territory of the residency” is mapped out
  e. The teacher and artist have equal voices in co-planning
  f. Student work projects are identified so the student becomes the focal point.
  g. Teachers discuss how they observe and do documentation.
  h. Participants who document what they got out of the training are paid, whether they publish it on the website or put what they learned in a curriculum.
Salvante-McCann noted that the groups had certain things in common
- Thoughtful planning
- A facilitator to help plan
- Ongoing processes
- Food

Panel 5’s Summary of the Session

Stories Of Successful Transfer To The Classroom

1. An expert conducts two full days around a specific topic; the teacher develops lesson models which are then implemented in the classroom. Support is given in standards, outcomes, etc.

2. The visual artist/poet has had prior training in the relationship between their art and kids; has done needs assessment with the teacher to plan integration for language arts, using a painting from a museum. Illustration: A Georgia O’Keefe desert painting about their world (New Mexico) becomes a natural jumping-off place.

3. The artist prepares an artistic activity during which teachers create works of art. Out of that the teachers create lessons to bring back to the classroom; part of the workshop involves looking for personal meaning in the artwork in order to spark their own interest.

Exemplary Team Teaching
Ownership Is Key: Facilitated In-Depth Planning Becomes Organic

1. Planning Scenario 1
   a. Begin with a champagne reception to share ideas, find partners; match up by the end of the first session
   b. Have 3-4 person teams of parent/student/teacher/artist with the administrator as facilitator
   c. A field trip to see another program sparks brainstorming; offer incentives, e.g. food, credit
   d. Follow the process by diversifying roles; build trust through role-playing; focus on a sharing of ideas.
   e. The philosophy of the teacher and artist gives them ownership of the project; the artist and teacher model for each other

2. Planning Scenario 2
   a. There is upfront agreement from the school district to focus on real art
   b. Have a planning retreat for partnering artists and teachers in a “gorgeous” place; offer incentives
   c. Create a multi-disciplinary arts piece with teacher input on the curriculum
   d. [They found that] the positive atmosphere attracted new teachers to the work
   e. They convinced the principal to commit planning time by doing a special session on active listening
   f. Provide child care; get a cell phone; have the teachers meet together; have regular mentoring visits

3. Planning Scenario 3
   a. Warm-up by sharing experiences, particularly stories of collaboration
   b. For “Homework” teachers and artists are asked, “What would you like to see happen in this residency?”
   c. Establish goals; begin co-planning based on them
   d. Plan the actual activities together

Promising Professional Development Practices

1. Authentic arts experiences are provided for teachers
2. A core group is trained to become mentors
3. Portfolios are maintained of successful practices/lessons
4. A rubric is developed of good lessons/curriculum; colleagues observe using the rubric
5. Workshops have facilitated planning with follow-up sessions in the classroom
6. Sequential professional development is offered at different levels
7. Quality is recognized and rewarded

**Ground-Breaking Practice**

A videotape is created for the artist to view and self-reflect on his own practice. The student is the focus. It is a concrete, non-threatening tool that provides for unexpected reverberations.

---

Panel 6 – Arlene Jordan, Facilitator

**Cleveland Symphony Orchestra** – Amy McClellan, Manager, School and Community Partnerships; Joan Katz Napoli, Director of Educational Programs

**Roosevelt Elementary School** – Jay Keefer, Principal

*McClellan:* We are now in the fourth year of the program (plus 1 year of planning); it was a pilot project. The CSO brings in arts professionals for demonstration lessons. We include successful teachers to add to the dialogue between the teachers and musicians. Specific training content includes classroom management; the musicians are given specific teaching skills and have one-on-one sessions to help them develop their lessons and presentations.

As the Cleveland Public Schools don’t have arts coordinators, the principals are supportive of this program. The principals meet at a roundtable with the CSO to discuss what’s working and what isn’t; the roundtable moves to all four schools and allows them to learn from each other. The district superintendent is supportive of professional development and facilitates release time for the teachers.

Planning time is written in; a professional development day is also provided where companion lessons are developed between the musicians and teachers. The lessons are transferred to the classroom: the classroom teachers co-teach with the musicians. Prospective teachers are informed about the program by the principal, so they know before they start what the expectation is.

The orchestra has a relationship with Columbia University Teachers College, which does formative evaluation.

*Keefer:* Cleveland teachers review the developmental appropriateness of the curriculum; I am able to write in the CSO experience as a piece of their formal continuing education for the board of education.

---

**New York Philharmonic** – Thomas Cabaniss, Director of Education

**P.S. 199** – Elaine Shapiro, 5th Grade Teacher

*Cabaniss:* The teachers have planning sessions and a series of workshops after school. They are paid an honorarium for their work in the program that falls outside of the school day and for their participation in the evaluation and assessment components. Every week a different grade meets from 3-5 p.m. The NYP teaching artists help shape the content for the workshops along with their teacher partners. Whereas the orchestra originally wrote the curriculum, now the teachers are constructing other cross-disciplinary curricula on their own time, which is then reviewed, edited, and subsequently published by the orchestra for all participants in the program.
The teaching artist and teacher work together for the entire year, which develops a comfort level. Illustration: A teacher reported that a lesson just didn’t work as an integral element of the classroom agenda – that it felt like “something extra.” Tom asked the teacher to help him understand the classroom goals and habits of mind over a series of lunch meetings. “Occasions like these affirm the importance of the process of artists developing a more comprehensive understanding of classroom process.”

The kids were able to demonstrate and articulate an awareness of the difference between Tom’s (the composer’s) process and the teacher’s (or “writer’s”) process.

Shapiro: “We had a cover conductor come to the classroom to demonstrate how she leads the orchestra. Watching the conductor at an actual performance, everyone noted the divergence from the in-class and concert experiences – an example of critical review.”

**Q: How does in-service training differ from pre-service?**

Cabaniss: The New York Philharmonic ‘drafts’ the best musicians from the conservatories, who then do professional development at the orchestra. This has helped the orchestra to focus in on what skills are necessary for working in the schools. In the second half, these artists create their own curriculum. Our outside evaluator is focusing on the ecology of the partnership, using teacher/teaching artist dyads from Lincoln Center Institute.

**Q: What are the professional development models that emphasize the strengths of the individual members of partnerships?**

Shapiro: Interdisciplinary learning connections are made through the different bases of knowledge of the partners.

**Participant:** A regional association such as the Empire State Partnership convenes teachers and artists in joint professional development planning.

**Participant:** Artists and teachers need to understand that even though they work differently, both can understand each other’s processes.

**Q: How do you know that there is a transfer of content knowledge from the orchestras to the schools?**

Both orchestras cited as evidence ownership that develops within the school as the teachers see their ideas implemented in the curriculum.

---

**Panel 7 – Sarah Jencks, Facilitator**

**Institute for Arts and Humanities Education (IAHE)** – Rina Shere, Executive Director, Maureen Heffernan, Artistic Director

**Paul Robeson Theme School for the Arts** – Freda Rhodes, Teacher

Shere: This residency involves a school (K-8) which has had traditional residencies in the past. The program brings together all the teachers for regular training in arts integration. Services are offered to the school one day per month. They can include demonstration of a model by the IAHE artistic director and artist/teacher trainer, grade-planning meetings, coaching meetings for individual teachers, artist-teacher co-teaching, or the artist observing teachers for coaching purposes. The arts specialist serves 3 days a week as an advisor/liaison for other non-arts teachers; she also writes grants, works on fund-raisers, and teaches 2 days per week. There are a lot of great cultural resources [in New Brunswick]. We try to bring that into the classrooms and make connections as much as possible.

The teachers and artists receive summer training for Family Arts workshops. This is actual professional development for teachers and artists, but also gives parents a hands-on explanation of why the arts are at the
center of the curriculum at this school. The teachers and staff artists meet 3 days for training in June; form teams; write lessons and meet again in August to try them out. In the fall the lessons are implemented, and the teams come together in December to give feedback. The teams of teachers are encouraged to adapt this experience to various grade levels. We have developed an effective critique session in which parents can say what they want. An evaluator was brought in to look at the overall program throughout the planning, training and implementation; both inside and outside evaluation occurred. The combined artist/teacher evaluation was also a professional development practice. Observations and evaluations provide feedback for teachers and artists.

**Tucson Arts Connections (TAC)** – Dr. Joan Ashcraft, Assistant Director, Tucson Union Free School District

**UA Presents, University of Arizona** – Benita Silvyn, Education Director

*Ashcraft/Silvyn:* Our training is based on state and national arts education standards. We train classroom teachers, to build their comfort level and develop their enthusiasm for integrating the arts into the classroom; we do not expect these teachers to become experts. The specially designated program coordinator is a former teacher who understands the issues and the environment and takes the teacher through every step, from professional development to residencies.

A Fine Arts Summer Institute (FASI) provides a week-long immersion for 180 teachers. They pay a $125 dollar fee but the district awards 3 graduate credits for attending. Many more want to be involved. A second FASI level was instituted for teachers returning for a third year, which includes deeper integration work toward producing a project to present to beginning teachers. All the teachers are invited to present their own integrated work from the school year.

We’ve also added a Fine Arts Youth Academy (3 weeks, 1000 students) in which the teachers from FASI have the opportunity to intern alongside the arts professionals running the Academy, and to put into practice some of what they have learned. The Youth Academy is scheduled right after the Summer Institute, which gives the teachers immediate practice time. The teachers are paid to work in the Youth Academy. The timing of FASI and the Youth Academy, as well as the creation of a second FASI level, were in response to requests and suggestions from the teachers. We also bring teams of teachers from a school together to present to other schools across the district.

The core team of administrators meets weekly during the year for two-an-a-half hours to plan professional development events and opportunities during the year. At least twice a year we invite teachers to come and provide feedback for the institute needed research, resources, activities and so on. The district team listens and responds to them. A possible new idea is to take teachers to California to see the masters at Laguna Beach, the Getty Museum, the theater, etc. This would be funded by the teachers themselves.

Follow-up during the year takes the form of regular communications and at least 2 meetings annually. The partnership leaders and staff meet every Monday to plan, discuss needs and share research and resources.

*Jencks* posed a number of questions:

1. On quality control: How do you have it and make sure everyone is meeting your expectations?
2. How do you work at filling needs in various areas?
3. How do you work towards building collaborative models with various groups?
4. How do you follow up and make sure transfer to the classroom is happening?
5. Are you documenting your success?

**IAHE**

a. Matching artist to teacher is critical. The coordinator at the school helps this happen
b. Attrition among teachers occurs “so we are [always] working on those gaps.” They have a special professional day just for new teachers
c. They have developed a video of 2 successful teachers to show at faculty meetings which includes debriefing between the artists and teachers
d. Needs assessment occurs with the one-on-one coaching of teachers

e. Successful lesson plans are “archived” and used repetitively

f. The focus is on developing a common vocabulary; there is a great need to have teachers
   understand different terms and concepts [that artists take for granted]

g. They are breaking down isolation – serving as a conduit between groups

TAC

a. Communication is critical: to ensure that others know the goals, you must have continuing dialogue
   and feedback

b. Quality needs to be recognized, and serves as a motivating force for others. They give awards at
   an Annual Gala and also recognize people at the opening day of the Summer Institute

c. “We value passionate teachers” – they can make the connections easily

Q: What is the overall staffing of these partnerships?

TAC has one full-time administrator, 11 staff at the district office with 2 on this project; there are 66,000
students, 165 arts specialists, 6 teaching artists per year. IAHE has no special person because it’s what it does.

Panel 7’s Summary of Promising and Portable Professional Development Practices

1. A Collaborative Model – Teachers and artist plan workshops for parents (another audience), and
   thereby engage the principal [who is always seeking ways to involve parents]

2. Buy-In
   a. Twice a year, hear back from the teachers to refine any sort of institute or other professional
      development delivery model
   b. Provide incentives – awards and continuing education credits to participating teachers
   c. Principals could suggest that one teaching observation be about an arts-related lesson
   d. Re hiring practices: teachers are alerted to the program when interviewed
   e. The principal and parents need to be involved in some authentic arts experience and then led
      through a reflective practice in order to help them become advocates for professional development
      and the arts

3. Quality Control
   a. Recognize and celebrate good models of teaching (through special events, forums at institutes,
      conferences, grade-level or faculty meetings)
   b. Present successful lessons at faculty meetings
   c. Expand the documentation of model lessons for dissemination: i.e. consider using video tape as a
      record; collect student work to share with other teachers
   d. As partners, develop rubrics for teachers and artists to follow while writing integrated lessons
   e. Keep talking, meeting and discussing; the standard of quality changes as the relationship evolves,
      levels move toward mentoring, and better models are created

Transfer Of Learning And Collaboration

1. On-site presence of the cultural partner makes a big difference in responsiveness and listening and
   helps ensure transfer of professional development to the classroom.

2. Hosting an Institute first, then immediately offering artist-teacher internship opportunities (e.g. at the
   Academy) creates a built-in place to apply new knowledge.

3. Professional development and the arts can become part of teacher conversations if encouraged by the principal.

4. A dedicated person is needed to work on fundraising. It’s best if it includes a person from both the arts
   organization and the school as a team.

5. In addition to the arts-organization directed workshops, build in time for teachers to train artists about
   classroom management, lesson planning and the school culture.

6. Involve teachers and artists in a collaborative project outside their immediate classroom (and away
   from pressures from the district or the arts organization)
Dance is a new field in public education....[it] has been aligned with physical education; the art has been left out of dance. We have a new obligation as dance educators in North Carolina: we have an eighth standard that dance is an art form and must be taught as such.

— Pamela Sofras
Quality Of Teaching And Learning – January 20 Morning Session

Jane Remer set the tone for the morning’s discussions by posing a number of related questions at the plenary session:

1. What was your best learning experience in school?
2. What made it the best – or most promising?
3. What criteria did you use when making your judgment?
4. Who was your best teacher?
5. What made her/him the best?
6. What criteria did you use when making your judgment?

**QUALITIES OF PEOPLES’ BEST LEARNING EXPERIENCES**

- a. Developing ownership
- b. Being able to make choices
- c. Opportunities to be self-critical
- d. Opportunities to tap into or discover one’s own talent
- e. Being intellectually or artistically “stretched”
- f. Learning that grows organically out of experience
- g. Doing work that was challenging and accessed one’s imagination
- h. Having a personal connection with the teacher over time (e.g. with an instrumental music teacher)
- i. Being self-motivated and self-monitored
- j. Having “Aha!” moments – Finding true understanding and making connections to prior experiences
- k. Being engaged in depth, over time
- l. Developing an emotional connection
- m. Having experiences that are kinesthetical, harmonious, physically expressive

**QUALITIES OF PEOPLES’ BEST/FAVORITE TEACHERS**

- a. Having high expectations and standards; “pushing” students
- b. Providing individualized response and instruction
- c. Showing “subversion”, honesty, and trustworthiness
- d. Making learning fun
- e. Showing connections, surprises
- f. Being willing to take risks
- g. Recognizing each student’s worth

After discussing the responses, Remer gave an “assignment” to the panels to construct a group definition for best/promising practices in learning and teaching based on personal experience. Regarding learner outcomes, she added:

1. What is a promising practice?
2. What makes it promising?
3. How do we define quality?

Remer concluded by reminding the assemblage that “teaching is a profession, not a job; perhaps it’s even a vocation.”
Kessler asked the panelists to begin by discussing the most effective teaching and learning practices within their partnerships, including the issue of maintaining the integrity of the arts.

Paul Robeson and Diego Rivera Academy
Tom DeCaigny, Program Manager; Julie Sparling, Arts Integrated Academic Instructor

Sparling briefly described some of the issues relating to the program: “There are currently 16 students in grades 7-9. The students have one foot in jail and one foot in school. The stated goal for the program is to improve the social behavior of the students. We have found that a tangible product or performance (something you can hold or videotape) is most effective for these students.”

Typically, they might collaborate with the drama teacher on a lesson about “how to make an apology” and “how to understand [your own and others’] feelings.” They choose a word, then connect it to sensory images. They role-play using “I” messages, comic book bubble statements; put words up on paper; they have them get in touch with their feelings first, and then do the lessons. “These kids need a non-threatening environment; they have to feel safe and be met where they are.” The program is structured but flexible. They reward students who can see and monitor their own progress. A homework assignment might be: “Create a scene from the word [used in class].” (Spelling is at a low skill level.) They receive much student feedback.

Robeson-Rivera’s Effective Practices

- Organic learning is encouraged and rewarded
- Students are encouraged to monitor their own progress
- Students’ ability to perceive in individual ways is respected
- They keep it structured but flexible, offering “structured alternatives”

ArtsConnection (AC) – Carol Morgan, Deputy Director for Programs
Elementary Teachers Network – Barbara Batton, Co-Director

Batton briefly reviewed the elements of the partnership: 10-week residencies in dance/movement, theater/drama; grades K-5; cohorts of 3-4 teachers per residency; planning time during the day; K-5 teams of teachers working together.

ArtsConnection’s Effective Practices

- The Program Is Process-Focused
  - Students are allowed to be apprentices
  - Teachers, artists and students explore their goals
  - Through an understanding of expectations, trust is built, both individually and in partnership
  - The residency is “negotiated space” between teachers and artists
- The Program Is Values-Based
  - Capacity building is encouraged, on the personal and skill-based level
  - Students are viewed as individuals in a democratic community
  - The strongest part of the curriculum is what emerges, not the script
d. Experimentation is highly regarded

• Morgan added additional practices
  a. Observing students in the process of creating art
  b. Viewing teaching as research
  c. Using teaching to model attitudes

Kessler observed that
- Reflection is powerful in both programs.
- They maintain space for the artist to work
- They don’t put the artist in the service of literacy, but find connections.
- Creative lessons change the culture of the school.

Kessler asked for “declarative statements” about teaching and learning.

Tom Cabaniss commented about the differences between teaching in the arts vs. teaching through the arts, observing that [the NY Philharmonic] consortium basically is not driven by the [state] Standards and that Standards best arise from within the work itself and the person in the process.

Morgan suggested that artists be asked to define their standards. “Most effective learning creates a ‘scaffolding sequence’ of experience that creates a safe environment open to flexibility.”

Janet Stein-Romero: “Trust is the basis for a ‘safe space.’ Value and respect content, learners, interaction, differences.”

Cabaniss: “Set clear boundaries”

Jackie Quay: “Build a caring community”

Stein-Romero: “Value quiet time for creative search”

Panel 8’s Summary of the Qualities of Effective Teaching and Learning

1. Reflection (observation and critique) is included; In partnerships, reflection is done as a team
2. Flexibility and structured alternatives are provided
3. Organic learning is rewarded and encouraged
4. A separate space is maintained for the arts
5. Students/learners are respected
6. It operates within and outside of formalized standards
7. The teaching arises from within the work itself, from the person and process
8. A safe environment is created in which differences are valued
9. The learner’s needs are met
10. It is a scaffolded sequence of experiences with consistency and continuity
11. Content and context are valued
12. It builds community
Panel 9 – Sarah Jencks, Facilitator

Jencks asked the panelists, “What are the inherent learning processes associated with the arts?” and the particular outcomes.

North Carolina Dance Theatre (NCDT) – Alain Charron, Director of Education
University of North Carolina at Charlotte – Pamela Sofras, Associate Professor of Dance

Charron: “[As a research project], NCDT is trying to get at promising practices; the idea is to change how the creative process is taught and tie it more closely to choreography. When we set up the project, the plan was to look at the process of choreography and document it with lots of video. Students see rehearsals and watch the process unfold without really having first-hand knowledge of the obstacles that resulted in the end product. It’s hard to teach about the process using hindsight. The project debunks the whole idea that there are not problems to be solved in the creation of a dance work.

“We collaborated with two schools, North Ridge Middle School (general) and Northwest School of the Arts (an arts magnet) for research, to bring [more artistically] sophisticated and neutral populations together. Part of the process of trying out lesson plans is having students test the prototype (a pre-service activity for dance educators), getting their feedback, trying to determine whether these lesson plans would or not work, and monitoring the students in the classroom. As part of our first middle school residency, we worked with the students on developing movement and source material. The company took it and created a piece for their repertoire. The students also created a work based on the source material which will be seen by the researchers.

“Alonzo King, an African-American choreographer, did an improvisation workshop, and got to the “nitty-gritty” of what he’s trying to do with artists. Every dance educator came although it was not required – they all wanted to be there. Some teachers decided to try out [King’s] materials in class and offer feedback; it was taken, edited, and made available.”

Charron focused primarily on the artist piece; the dance specialists are now working with the elementary school teachers to see how they can extrapolate from the material to other levels – to find the place where they can “enter into” the material. The project started with a professional dance company, a university dance ed program and dance educators thinking about how could they could contribute to the field. [Initially], they weren’t looking beyond the need for materials. They “wish they had had these materials in college.”

Sofras: “Dance is a new field in public education; we don’t have text books or any other teaching materials. Consequently, we had fully-licensed dance teachers doing the same thing over and over. The education materials from our national organizations weren’t geared to an older student audience; there was nothing that had any relevance to the students. Since NCDT performs and commissions original work, they are able to bring in choreographers who are at work, so the students can see them and get to know them. [In so doing], they are trying to bring the children into the art form.

“Dance has been aligned with physical education; the art has been left out of dance. We have a new obligation as dance educators in North Carolina: we have an eighth Standard that dance is an art form and must be taught as such.”

Charron: “[Despite this] dance is not represented on the [school] fine arts team, although the physical education specialist has been invited to the meetings.”

NCDT’s Promising Practices
• Examine what you are trying to teach and determine whether or not it could be placed in the context of a valid and meaningful lesson
• Offer professional development opportunities to the arts educators to work directly with a performing or visual artist, e.g. a choreographer.
• Use source material developed by the students as the basis for both professional and student-created work.
• The company’s primary mandate is education

Jencks observed that the creative problem is at the center – the creative process and the energy involved in the shaping of an artwork. What NCDT is working on now is how one reconstructs a dance – how you preserve it and construct entry points at different levels of achievement.

**New York City Opera (NYCO)** – Paul L. King, Director of Education

**Martin Luther King, Jr. High School** – Maureen Nobile, Arts Access Director

*King:* The City Opera-MLK partnership is also about points of entry. [Opera is] a mongrel art form, with vocal and instrumental music, dance, stage direction, visual arts, a libretto and dramatic literature. These kids have little or no exposure to classical music, which causes some resistance. For over six years we have been working on finding a way to connect with them. We are learning to move beyond the “pure” art form and are now more interested in the connections being made and in how we assess that the students are making those connections [We have found that] what resonates is passion, in the artist and the art form, e.g. people killing each other. The musicological way is not the best entry point, which is important for teaching artists to know. Some of the school arts specialists were resistant to this idea. We have collected teaching material that no one wants to use; instead, each team wants to find its own themes and build individually. For example, we have five residencies on *Traviata*, none of which are thematically the same.

**NYCO’s Promising Practices**

• Each residency involves student creation of art
• They are highly participatory – not lectures, but out-of-seat experiences
• All culminate in student work: students have written arias, a mock trial scene
• NYCO has an interest in and is investigating making connections with the students
  Nobile added additional positive steps that contribute to the quality of teaching and learning
  • Teachers are paid for extra time according to their level of involvement
  • Student work is increasingly put at the center
  • Students can become interns and take classes at Lincoln Center, which has helped change the Center administration’s attitude towards young people
  • Individual teachers and students get free tickets, which helps reduce some of the hostility towards Lincoln Center
  • The school is putting on *Treemonisha* over three years — one act each year. It’s not easy as they are not an arts school; they have clubs that support it. It’s now part of the culture of the kids
  • The distinction between interdisciplinary teaching and pure arts is blurred

*Nobile* discussed the pressure on the teachers in the school. “They get extra pay for developing regents-based schoolwork because it is a huge task to get the students to pass (80% in the arts track pass; among those not in this track, 10-20% pass). Everyone is connected to this need, so it helps in that it’s not just about the arts – maybe it’s about the community. The school will be closed in 2 years if we don’t meet our ‘box office’, i.e. good test results, just as a dance company will close if doesn’t meet its box office projections and get funding.”

*Charron:* An editor who read the material [NCDT] produced said that you can look past the dancing into the dance. We presented their materials at the national level, and now special ed and phys ed teachers are seeing how they can use it. He noted that they don’t teach to Standards, they use them as assessment tool to see what they have covered. They began a study which has evolved into local curricula based on the Standards, without losing the integrity of dance.
King: “We [NYCO] don’t have research people; it would help to have a real research component. You can’t do every thing at the same time; it has to be incremental; it’s impossible to put it all in place and pay for it at once.”

Panel 9’s Summary of Promising Practices in Teaching and Learning

1. Connecting to the partner realities (Standards and Board)
2. Acknowledging of the artistic lives of the teachers
3. Self-selection by participating teachers
4. Involvement of pre-service teachers and artists
5. Parental/community involvement
6. Teacher and teaching artist must plan a flexible structure
7. Continual examination of what you are teaching – macro/micro
8. An awareness of the ongoing “work” of learning
9. Reflection afterwards
10. Making student work central to the development of the project
11. Creating opportunities for teachers, teaching artists and students to make art
12. Constructing connections between art and other areas
13. Attaching the teaching to the universal and the personal appeal/experiences of the learner
14. Creating a risk-taking atmosphere
15. Providing multiple entry points for access

Panel 10 – Arlene Jordan, Facilitator

Jordan posed the following questions:

• What is your most effective teaching practice and why?
• Where do you find success in maintaining integrity in arts teaching?
• What are your criteria for a) effectiveness, b) quality

Young Audiences/New York (YANY) – Noah Lewin, Teacher
Readers Theatre Workshop – Andrew Salgado, Executive Director; Hank Wagner, Teaching Artist

Salgado: Regarding our most effective teaching practices, we started with what the students knew and understood (especially at a special needs school for 15-21 year olds). We used video to create a movie, including sets, props, etc. The students picked up social skills by working with one another. They had something substantive to talk about, rather than picking on one another.” [Initially], the Hispanic students wanted a Spanish soap opera; their criterion was ‘looking good.’ Out of this, a film festival developed at the school. Now the teachers do it on their own, without the artists. The students are now making choices, voicing preferences regarding what they want to do, choosing a genre.

YANY’s Signs of Effective Teaching and Learning

• Students are learning about genres, characters, literacy e.g. ghost vs. zombie
• Students are choosing their different roles in front of and behind the camera
• They are learning to communicate with one another, “though it’s been a struggle”
• The classroom teachers have also taken on some roles, from parts in the film to working on budgets
• Students do the technical trouble-shooting, e.g. replacing batteries, keeping track of the film and camera lenses
• The students are eager, e.g. they finished lunch early to work on the next steps of the project
• Students have taken ownership of their own work

They are preparing students to be part of a future workforce, (though they still need to prepare them for tests) Multiple skills will be needed, including interpersonal skills.

---

**Studio in a School** – Amy Chase Gulden, Manager, Long Term Program  
**PS 213** – Gail Flanery, Teaching Artist; Lynn Moser, Teacher, Grade 5

_Gulden_ noted that Studio has lots of similarities to YANY; they have been comparing notes with each other.

---

**Allocating classroom time**

• The program combines learning in the arts with language arts; connections between language and visual images appear throughout the classroom; there are now assumptions and expectations in the curriculum that were not there previously, e.g. the teacher keeps a language profile that mirrors the artwork
• The teachers are doing integrated lessons on their own, using the artists as a resource. They have integrated lessons from examples and professional development activities that are now in their repertoire; they do them on their own and initiate new projects with the artists
• The teachers are more comfortable with process work because they can let go of some of the product-pressure. They value the learning that happens in the problem-solving and investigating [of creating art], having seen this validated in the art studio, and seek to create more of these opportunities in their classrooms. This process has “allowed teachers to trust themselves.” They don’t copy each other’s ideas (i.e. do exactly the same lesson), but adapt and adopt ideas they admire (in much the same way students are empowered to do so)
• Some of the more resistant teachers are “moving away from Xeroxes” and beginning to experiment with allowing students opportunities to create their own imagery, work from observation, etc.; the computer teacher is making the distinction between child-created imagery and clip art
• The Standards were re-written by the artist and students so they could understand them. They put these Standards, or expectations, on the wall in the classroom. They are discussed often; the artist points out what the students are learning. The artists can state clear learning goals, provide criteria, and assess the work along these lines, as the teachers must do
• The artists ask lots of reflective questions and eventually the students also begin to question
Studio’s Signs of Most Effective Learning

• The kids take more risks
• There is no more “cookie cutter work”, i.e. copying. They can recognize a good idea and then use it in a way that works for them, i.e., personalize it
• They are learning that art can be “read”; their observations are very astute
• They see the connections between the studio and classroom, see their teachers as learners alongside them, see that learning is something you do throughout your life

Their Most Effective Practices

• Partnering – co-teaching in the art studio
• Mentoring new teachers and teachers who are not receiving the arts for one semester, which allows time to plan and implement integrated lessons in their classrooms
• Making links between concepts in life and in art... or classroom concepts
• Sketchbook journals for students
• Sketchbook conversations between studio and classroom
• Making parallels between problem solving in the classroom and in the art room – and being clear about defining problems (and helping the kids learn to define them)
• Having kids stop and review and verbalize at the end of every lesson. Always asking, “What worked?” “What didn’t work?” “How can we change it?” “What did we find out?”
• Working with portfolios – and inviting students to be reflective about their own work – looking at work over time.
• As artists and teachers, taking time to look at student work, evaluating the results to fuel planning and a deepening of the approach.

On Maintaining The Integrity Of The Arts

YANY

• Analyze the integrity of the art form; develop a rubric that includes criteria for good work, and then transmit that to the students
• Combine multiple elements to make a quality product
• Generate important discussions by having the students watch different genre films to learn/identify appropriate (or inappropriate) behavior
• Maintain the integrity of the project through continuously working with the teachers. The teachers set appropriate parameters for behavior, e.g. “the film or music can’t include cursing or violence” (setting criteria); they have worked out agreements between students and teachers regarding acceptable language.

Studio in a School

• Students experience different materials and know their uses and differences
• Students plan what they will do with the materials
• They know what other artists do, such as abstract painting, even if it’s not part of their art production, i.e. they learn about the bigger picture
• The artist relies heavily on his/her own experience and brings that to the classroom
• Art as a concrete object is used to make inferences, i.e. think in the abstract
• The artists, teachers and students perceive the school as a museum or arts institution

Flanery (artist): The practice of defining my art learning goals and expectations for each class has spurred me to greater clarity in my own teaching and thinking. This has helped to keep a clear focus on the arts learning, side by side, with the clearly defined curricular and thinking goals the teachers bring to the conversation. Every assignment includes a list of curricular/discipline criteria alongside a separate sign of art learning criteria. This is visible in all displays of student work. Standards for both strands are usually included too. So keeping the arts learning in focus hasn’t been such a problem with this school.
Panel 10’s Criteria for Effective Teaching and Learning

1. For Effective Teaching
   a. Meets goals or Standards
   b. Has an impact on the student’s values and their future decisions/choices
   c. Students take the initiative, work on their own – internalize – are self-motivated
   d. Students ask questions

2. For Effective Learning
   a. Students make refinements in their work; do something multiple times
   b. Students make connections with something they learned before
   c. Students have the vocabulary to express themselves
   d. There is evidence from the student of understanding the process
   e. Students are proud, engaged, joyous; (there should be rigor in measuring the joy as well)
   f. Creativity is in evidence
   g. There is evidence of personal investment (students take what they are given and go further)

Panel 11 – Facilitator: Margaret Salvante-McCann

Salvante-McCann asked her panelists to begin by discussing the qualities of an effective teacher.

New York Philharmonic – Tom Cabaniss
Elaine Kaufman Cultural Center – Sean Hartley

Summary of the Discussion

On Qualities of an Effective Teacher

• The ability to transfer the motivation for learning from an external source (teacher) to an internal source (student); to move students toward taking responsibility for their own learning
• An ability to understand the needs of the student and a method to get that student “there.”
• The teacher is an expert in her/his field; knows the content and how to situate the learning in broader terms, e.g. an art teacher who is equally adept at doing the art form, teaching the art form, and also relating it to other subject areas
• Some ways in which teachers create learning environments where children feel free to take risks
  a. Offering a variety of activities
  b. Recognizing special abilities
  c. Encouraging children to try and using mistakes as valued as part of learning and not punished.
  d. Knowing effective strategies for classroom management
• A willingness to take risks and be ready to acknowledge that everyone in a classroom is a learner, not just the students
• The ability to set up challenging learning for children within their “proximal range of development.”
• The ability to empower children to be leaders and model positive behavior/learning
• The ability to take advantage of all of the students’ mistakes to get to the desired outcome, e.g. the kid who says he has “written” a piece of music, who can play it but can’t write it down.
• The ability to plan and implement lesson plans
Q: Are there special qualities for teachers who are working in partnerships?

• The ability to empower children, to give them the opportunity to participate in the process of “what do I need to learn”, i.e. the teacher doesn’t totally define the agenda.

Q: Can we list qualities of learning?

• Opportunities to make connections occur in many different ways (per Gardner’s theories)
• It’s fun, yet challenging
• Many opportunities to succeed are provided
• External verification of the learning is not needed

Participant: “But internal validation is not enough. The learning environment pushes the student to constantly raise the bar and have higher expectations.”

There was disagreement in the group as to whether or not internal validation of success is a skill which should be “developed” or simply recognized. David Myers, observing, brought the discussion further into the context of partnership, saying, “If we can’t say that there is a benefit to partnerships, then why do them?” A hypothetical question was posed:

Q: Do arts partnerships offer a unique opportunity to effect promising learning?

The subsequent discussion brought out the following points about the qualities of partnerships as they relate to effective teaching and learning:

• It enables learning for all participants (students, teachers, artists, administrators, parents)
• A variety of expertise is brought to the learning
• Many stakeholders (parents, administrators, etc.) come together to make it work; everybody learns from one another
• Meaningful ways are provided to validate and evaluate the process

Participant: “Models are needed that shift from the artist as the leader of the process to one that is more collaborative.”

There was some discussion in response to David Myers’ comments as to whether an advantage of a partnership is the fact that the artist is an outsider.
“What I’m hearing is that assessment is most effective when it becomes part of the work and is part of the discussions that evolve, when it helps teachers know better whether they are being successful in doing what they are there for. On the other hand, funder requirements and other external forces are sometimes looking for other results. How can these two be more closely aligned? Could it be that the artist philosophy is missing, that art is being examined as the savior of critical thinking?”

—— RICHARD KESSLER
Program Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning – January 20 Afternoon Session

Jane Remer opened the afternoon plenary session by relating one of her own experiences with evaluation and assessment. She took the group through all the steps, including what worked and what did not, what modifications were made, and what she learned from the experience. She gave the panel sessions two questions to address:

**What are we assessing and how are we assessing it?**
**How do we know [student learning] when we see it?**

Panel 12 – Arlene Jordan, Facilitator

**Institute for Arts and Humanities Education (IAHE) –** Dr. Rina Shere, Executive Director  
**Paul Robeson Theme School for the Arts –** Charles Collins, Principal  
**Young Audiences/New York (YANY) –** Andrew Salgado, Executive Director, Readers Theatre Workshop

The panelists began by discussing what they are trying to accomplish with their programs and what they think should be evaluated. It was noted that this did not always agree with what the outside evaluators were analyzing.

_Salgado:_ The Brooklyn School for Career Development is for students with severe learning disabilities. The students are one level away from being classified as mentally retarded. Two YANY artists have two 45-minute classes per week, or one for 90 minutes, from October through May. Much of the program is about improving communication and social skills through the arts. In addition to the video project (described earlier), we have a music, dance and theater program. From the artist’s perspective, the focus is on the art product; the program goals relate to acting, technology and teamwork applied through learning. The program people look at whether the students’ social and communication skills have increased; at whether they have a good speaking voice. In addition to assessing student portfolios, video was used as an assessment tool; it helped students see where they’ve come from, and what they need to refine. We have had some success in tracking students for 2-3 years.

The assessment team for the project is from Columbia University Teachers College. Salgado expressed concern that the current evaluation rubric looks only at behavior and not at the work, which is the end product. The evaluators interview students and pre- and post-test them. They also are looking at how well the teachers in the school value the program. There’s been an increase in supportive teachers. They know that they have accomplished their goals when “the kids teach each other about the camera, or about acting”.

They have a conflict with the evaluators [because] the artists/teachers want the students to do self-assessment [even though] these students are not too able to reflect verbally. They use portfolios as well as written stories by the students (e.g. “Which student has done the best work? What do you think?”) Often the level of questions [asked by the evaluators] is along the lines of “did the student turn on the camera?”

**Q: What is being evaluated?**

- End product and process  
- Theater standards, e.g. speaking voice, acting ability  
- Technology, e.g. camera work, sound, editing
• Applied learning: finishing in a timely fashion (time management); sticking together as a unit (team work)
• Understanding of the value of education
• Student comprehension and responsibility: teaching each other skills, e.g. use of camera

Q: How do they do it?

• **School (2-3 Years):**
  1. Using video as an assessment tool – reworking and refining the video
  2. Clues that it was working: comment like “It’s starting to look like a movie”; “The microphone should have been closer.”
  3. Student reflection sheets (basic) – portfolios, note-taking
  4. Questionnaires – students critique each others’ work

• **Teachers’ College**
  a. Rubric – behavior, not artwork
  b. Interviews – pre and post for students
  c. Interviews – pre and post for teachers

• **Their Frustrations**
  a. Uncertainty about whether the program people and evaluators are on the same page, i.e. do they agree about what to look for.
  b. A definition of quality, in this context
  c. Lack of student verbalization
  d. High teacher turnover rate at this school (average: 3 years)

*Shere:* The INTERARTS program at Robeson School is being evaluated. It’s often thematic and is about arts integration. The Standards being met are about cultural heritage and aesthetics/criticism.

Q: How is it being evaluated?

The outside evaluator [for this project], a big research firm, conducted the student assessment and program evaluation. Their focus was on attitudinal rather than artistic outcomes. We held symposiums with the artists to help determine the evaluation focus, which was necessary because the artists were often not articulate. As the artists were trained, they began to deepen their questions. Due to limited time for the project and for videotaping lessons, the program focused on art production, which took time away from esthetic learning and assessment. They encountered resistance to the project from some of the teachers.

Shere feels that “one part of evaluation is to discover what it is that makes these teachers resistant.” She contrasted this experience with their Family Program, 4 evening sessions for parent and child with teams of an artist and 2 teachers. In this case, the outside evaluator was an integral part of the project, with an ongoing exchange of information. “The evaluator knew what IAHE was looking for. We worked together on designing questionnaires, rubrics and surveys. Evaluation sheets were given to the teams, parents, and students. The most frequently cited descriptive word was ‘fun.’ A student commented: ‘No one ever asked what I thought before.’”

*Shere* added that a research study at a university is needed to compare schools with arts programs with those without them.

*Jordan* asked the group to look at how program assessment results in changes in the classroom.
Panel 12’s Summary of Change as a Result of Assessment

1. TEACHER GROWTH
   a. Identifying alternative assessments
   b. Making connections
   c. Finding resources
   d. Asking better questions
   e. Separating student work from student behavior
   f. Teachers can better identify children’s abilities (the arts are sometimes a solution to behavioral problems)
   g. Teachers requesting to team teach, becoming better team players

2. ARTIST GROWTH
   a. Keeping students focused
   b. Validating students and their work
   c. Improving quality; raising the bar
   d. Artists and teachers realizing they need each other

Panel 13 – Richard Kessler, Facilitator

New York City Opera (NYCO) – Paul L. King, Director of Education
Martin Luther King, Jr. High School (MLK) – Maureen Nobile, Arts Access Director
ArtsConnection (AC) – Barbara Batton, Elementary Teachers Network (Evaluator)

Q: What is being evaluated?

King: “Our research question is What impact does this program have on student learning in the areas of academic achievement and social development? The needs of the program drive the assessment. The other question: What are the changes in teacher attitudes and practice? When we started, it was too big; we tried to do a quantitative assessment involving, among other things, test scores and attendance, but it wasn’t very informative for us as partners. [It’s important to establish] who the assessment is for. Quantitative pressures may come from funders. Now we assess in a variety of different ways.

“The district superintendent said that if the program didn’t have an impact on [NY State] regents test scores, he didn’t want it, so he did look at the results. The students in the program scored 60-80% passing, while the mean for the school is more like 20%. We are able to track the regents’ scores by the student ID numbers. One must be careful [when interpreting this], because it is not solely because the arts are there.” King thinks the program creates an environment where they are working together, bringing these skills into test preparation; the teachers use skills like improvisation to help students learn things.

“The teachers started developing English-related regents tests in the arts. Regents exams are tough and high school students need to pass most out of seven of them. Now all the kids have to take the regents, which happened in the middle of our program. Because of the regents statistics, the principal gave us the opportunity to run professional development for other staff members.”

Q: How is it being evaluated?

NYCO’s Assessment Tools
   a. Substantive evaluations with both the teachers and teaching artists
   b. Student written journals
   c. Student performance work
   d. A classroom observation rubric that looks at how the teacher and teaching artist are working and how the student is engaged
They have seen that, for those teachers who choose to participate, their students are more deeply involved and engaged in learning. They also based their evaluations on teacher testimony and read and reviewed student evaluations and writing samples. The teachers and teaching artists are asked the same questions in order to get both perspectives; they compare the outcome of the project with the plan. There is a lot of pressure for results out of a fear of losing the program. The MLK graduation rate is low: 200 out of a class of 1500.

“There have been substantial changes in teacher attitudes and practices and, whereas we used to have to recruit from the teaching faculty, now we have to select because of too much interest. The staff who are involved in the program presented a professional development workshop for the rest of the staff on Treemonisha. Steve Seidel [from Harvard Project zero] was helpful in informing their idea of assessment.”

Nobile recommended that organizations “don’t use the handouts, except as prompts to finding your own solutions” and added, “there is no shortcut to finding your own tools.” She said that she could tell her story of assessment and include the tools online, but that “it needs the passion, needs the specificity.”

Batton (ETM) tries to go to one entire residency for each artist. She does write-ups about the residency and attends the planning meetings. Also, the children keep reflective journals and there are talks between the artist and the kids; the final session is for debriefing. They are moving towards using video

Batton described changes as a result of the evaluation process:

a. The principal has moved from a “programmatic managerial type” to an advocate for inquiry-based learning. He now has one-and-one half hour weekly grade meetings [about the project].
b. They are looking towards common projects, e.g. Black History Month, on which to base a sequential learning curriculum
c. Whereas the program was initially tied to ‘reading the world’ (literacy/world), they have now moved away from that since “the strong emphasis on the literacy piece diluted the art part.” They now ask, How can artists and teachers, separately and together, provide an education for students and teachers? What processes and protocols can help us gain collective knowledge in the education of children?

Batton stated that they don’t have to answer [assessment questions] with quantitative data. They do want to see what is intrinsic in what they are doing that will move students and teachers along.

- OPEN DISCUSSION

Participant: In the YANY tape of kids with disabilities, they wanted to assess the students’ literacy skills. They used videotape to see student progress; the students saw themselves as well. The tape was used as a documentation tool and as a learning tool.

Participant: It’s subjective versus objective [measurements] that we want to evaluate.

Participant: One problem is staff turnover; evaluation and assessment requires a learning process. Usually the artists and teachers need to be trained in this area.

Batton: I’m also conducting reading and writing connections. Third graders are recounting what happens, [but] how do you move beyond that in the journal writing? They are having the students look at it as a personal experience.

Studio in a School talked about exchanging artwork between students, using a shared vocabulary, and having them explain what they saw in each other’s work.

Q: How are the results of the Empire State Partnership assessments used?

Arts Connection: Schools and principals use it; the report is a way of [disseminating] information. Everyone in the building wants to know what’s going on in [the program]; otherwise, the staff members who are not involved in it wouldn’t know.

Batton: I’m looking at what’s sustainable, what’s life after the residency. What is the value of arts education
post-residency? There is the possibility of a student going on in dance, and some teachers are taking on playwriting, [but] it’s hard to quantify it; the development is uneven. The greatest exposure is to the students, even though the teacher may have bought in. Students are saying, ‘I found my inner dance confidence.’ Teachers are recognizing that there is something inside that can come out – a power in dance: one learned that ‘however you dance is how you feel.’ Students are using more developed language than last year. The whole notion of jumping into the dance is a metaphor for something going on here.

King: People don’t establish a baseline. It’s very difficult to look backwards, to see where you were.

Kessler: I am hearing that assessment is most effective when it becomes part of the work and is part of the discussions that evolve, when it helps teachers know better whether they are being successful in doing what they are there for. On the other hand, funder requirements and other external forces are sometimes looking for other results. How can these two be more closely aligned? Could it be that the artist philosophy is missing, that art is being examined as the ‘savior of critical thinking?’ He wondered if the same kind of passion could be applied to all education. The arts organizations are looking at changing demographics, at how to reach out to people less served.

Participant: I am concerned about assessment as a political document vs. a tool for learning.

Tucson Arts Connections: “We have more latitude to do different kinds of assessment such as portfolio reviews. The west does not have the money to be concerned about this kind of subtle outside evaluator stuff; it’s simply not on the plate.”

Panel 14 – Sarah Jencks, Facilitator

**Fitton Center for Creative Arts** — Jackie Quay, Director of SPECTRA+®

**Miami University** — Dr. Richard Luftig, Researcher

**North Carolina Dance Theatre (NCDT)** — Alain Charron, Director of Education

**University of North Carolina at Charlotte** — Pamela Sofras, Associate Professor of Dance

Luftig introduced the subject by giving an overview of evaluation. He asked the group to think about the following:

1. Why do we assess?
2. Who will use the information?
3. What do we use the information for?
4. What type of evaluation do we want to do?
   a. Summative or formative?
   b. Differences in the behavior of students?
   c. Diagnostic – strengths or weaknesses of the program?
5. What do we want to measure?
   a. Children, teachers, artists
   b. Outcomes: educational; arts – appreciators or producers?
   c. Affective, mental health dimensions
   d. Validity – does the program meet its goals?
   e. Does the program measure any useful skills?
6. What are our research questions?
Luftig suggested that organizations should consider working with both quantitative and qualitative evaluations/tools.

Quay: It is important to also keep in mind the politics of arts in education, what about student learning can be shown to political entities. With all the high stake testing of children and pressures on schools to be accountable for student scores, it has been driven home to us time and again that we need to provide the data that demonstrate that the arts do impact student learning – not only in the arts but in other academic areas also. To not recognize that this type of thinking exists in educational circles outside the arts is to cut your own throat. Does that mean that we devalue the arts as individual subjects in the curriculum? Absolutely not!

Ohio schools are only required to have visual art and music in the elementary schools and they can be taught by regular classroom teachers holding elementary certification. SPECTRA+ requires that dance and drama be added to the curriculum as individual subjects and that all arts classes are taught by either certified arts teachers or professional artists when a certified arts teacher is not available. Children in SPECTRA+ schools receive more minutes of instruction in the arts than what is required by state law. What this means to a site is less time in reading, mathematics, social studies, language arts and more time in the arts. Teachers become far more efficient and there is less down time within the classrooms in order for teachers to ‘get through’ the school curriculum. This doesn’t include visiting artists or performances or short-term artists-in-residence. AIR’s are in addition to regular arts instruction occurring at each grade level.

SPECTRA+ uses various assessment instruments, including the Ohio proficiency test scores (Ohio), Self-concept (Brock), the Cromwell Locus of Control, the Torrence Test of Creative Thinking, the Manitoba and Princeton art appreciation scales and others. They are looking for a correlation with, not a cause of, student improvement.

NCDT

Sofras: The Charlotte/Mecklenberg school system has the arts on their report cards as well as a 1-credit arts requirement for high school graduation. We use assessment rubrics in the classrooms. [Although Capturing Creativity is a research project] there has been no scientific study of student learning. The data collected thus far has been a by-product of the program; it is naturalistic and anecdotal as opposed to scientific. Scientific assessment tools have yet to be developed for the project. Collection of data has been driven by assessment of student product developed as a result of the program. Michael Sykes of the Cultural Education Collaborative in Charlotte, North Carolina has been helpful in an advisory capacity regarding evaluation. The CMS Office of Instructional Accountability must approve all instruments of evaluation. We do not have to worry about the presence of the arts in the schools but, rather, the quality of instruction and evaluation.

Charron: We are (looking at) evaluating the quality of solutions to the creative problem presented in order to determine the effectiveness of the material developed. The National Standards for Dance Education were designed using the creative process in dance, that of choreography. Beyond the fundamental principles of form and design, the curriculum uses problem-solving to accomplish its goals. The work is presented as an outcome, which translates as problems a real choreographer had to solve in the creation of a work. Outcomes are judged against, and must meet, national and state Standards.

• General Discussion on Issues of Assessment

Cabaniss: Self esteem is nearly impossible to measure, which is why organizations like ours don’t do it.

Quay: That may be so [with the NY Philharmonic], but we do just that with SPECTRA+ using the Battle Self Esteem Inventory, short form A & B, and have found strong, significant correlation between the program and higher levels of student self esteem, especially parental self-esteem.

Luftig: Why don’t we partner?

It was observed that while SPECTRA+ is looking at abilities outside the arts and curriculum areas, NCDT is looking at abilities in the arts, specific to a particular curriculum unit.
Charron: Assessment and evaluation are here to stay, and arts partners should become cognizant of this. [If need be] hire people to do it when you don’t know how.

Participant: While evaluation and assessment are useful to satisfy producers, funders and others [who demand them] they are also an internal tool to improve the quality of work.

Panel 14’s Summary of Evaluation and Assessment Issues

SPECTRA+
- Have outsiders do the work
- Use a broad range of evaluation/assessment instruments to validate the findings
- Look at abilities outside of the arts
- Have curricular controls, e.g. state and national goals in the arts
- Have professional development controls, i.e. train teachers in what you want them to know

NCDT
- Look at the authenticity of the work and the artistic process
- Use a broad range of instruments that are tied to the curriculum
- Assess the students’ arts abilities
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**David E. Myers** is Professor of Music Education and Associate Director of the School of Music at Georgia State University in Atlanta. His professional interests focus on teacher education, lifespan continuity in music learning, and collaborative music education programs. In 1978, he received an NEA/Pennsylvania Council on the Arts grant to host a year-long composer residency in the middle school in which he taught. He subsequently designed numerous residency programs, including a commissioned opera for middle school. He has served on education panels of state arts councils and the NEA, including service as chair of NEA’s Education and Access Panel for Music and Opera. In 1997, he founded Georgia State’s Center for Educational Partnerships in Music.

A frequent writer and presenter on collaborative music education programs, Dr. Myers has been an education consultant to numerous organizations, including the Atlanta Symphony, New York Philharmonic, and Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra. In 1995-96, he conducted a national study of orchestra partnerships with schools and communities under an NEA grant, and in 1996 he was a keynote speaker on this topic for the national conference of the American Symphony Orchestra League. He recently presented a session on collaborative professional development models for teachers and musicians at the International Society for Music Education in Edmonton. He is also directing a Texaco-funded project to establish a curriculum-based music education partnership among Georgia State University, the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra, Young Audiences of Atlanta, and three elementary schools in the Atlanta area.

Dr. Myers holds degrees from Lebanon Valley College, the Eastman School of Music, and The University of Michigan. He taught at the University of Wisconsin-Madison prior to coming to Georgia State, and has been a visiting lecturer in music education at the University of Sydney (Australia).

**Jane Remer** is an author, editor and an independent consultant in education, the arts and the arts-in-education. Her work includes program design, long-range planning, professional development, evaluation and assessment. She teaches at New York University and serves as the Executive Director for the Capezio/Ballet Makers Dance Foundation. She is also visiting lecturer in music education at the University of Sydney (Australia). She teaches at New York University and serves as the Executive Director for the Capezio/Ballet Makers Dance Foundation. She teaches at New York University and serves as the Executive Director for the Capezio/Ballet Makers Dance Foundation. She teaches at New York University and serves as the Executive Director for the Capezio/Ballet Makers Dance Foundation. A former Associate Director of the Arts in Education Program of the John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund, Ms. Remer has worked with public and private agencies and organizations at the national, state and local levels.

In addition to writing for national publications, she is the author of *Changing Schools through the Arts: How to Build on the Power of an Idea*, (McGraw-Hill,1982, American Council for the Arts, 1990, and Americans for the Arts, 1999). Ms. Remer’s latest book, *Beyond Enrichment: Building Effective Arts Partnerships with Schools and Your Community* was published by ACA in the spring of 1996. Jane Remer is listed in Marquis’ *Who’s Who of American Women*, is a graduate of Oberlin College (’54) and Yale Graduate School (’57), and attended Yale Law School (’54-’55). She is the mother of two grown children and has been a public school program administrator, teacher, dancer, choreographer, actress, director, musician and poet.
Participant Assessment

The qualitative data below represents the two to three most frequently cited responses to select questions in the participant assessment. Other responses were documented and are listed in appendix A.

FIELD PERSPECTIVE: THE MOST PROMISING PRACTICES

Best Practices. “Workshops that bring parents, educators, students, and artists together” emerged as the most prevalent theme for best practices in the field of arts and education. One respondent reported that investment in this area lends itself to the intergenerational support of arts and education thus ensuring its long-term survivability and relevancy to schools and communities.

Three additional themes emerged frequently among survey respondents: (1) “Focus on at-risk students,” (2) “Focus on measurable results,” and (3) “Long-term sustainability of partnerships.” Many respondents viewed the arts and education as a viable means to address the needs of at-risk students in ways that other interventions do not. According to one respondent, “arts and education programs not only teach technical arts skills but also life skills by teaching kids to develop, process, and complete projects as well as engage in critical reflection about their work and the work of others.” Several respondents alluded to the vital importance of maintaining partnerships with other institutions as part of a “community” effort to advance arts and education. Concerns arose around the need to develop strategies for fostering said partnerships particularly between organizations that are “culturally” different (i.e., an arts organization culture vs. a school organization culture vs. a religious organization culture, etc.).

Attitudes Conducive to Success. “Reciprocity of learning” was frequently mentioned as key to the advancement of promising practices. This was followed by “espousing shared values and goals among all stakeholders” and “learning to draw on each others’ strengths.” Respondents believed that more work is necessary in training people in communication and interrelationship skills building as one of several methods for advancing arts and education. According to one respondent, “…as multiple institutional types come around the table to develop arts and education programs how can different views about arts and education be valued and respected?”

Policy Issues. Without question, a key theme heard by most of the survey respondents (29 out of 38 respondents) was the importance of securing funding for arts and education efforts. One respondent reported, “there is a lack of sufficient funding for the arts coupled with the view by the public that what we do should be done solely for intrinsic value as opposed to values associated with the need to get paid.” Another respondent reported on the need to lobby and get policy makers at local and national levels to include the arts in education standards and education reform –“otherwise we will continue to be left out of the dialogue on education.”

What difficulties do we face in the field trying to implement promising practices?

Communication Issues. Concern arose repeatedly among respondents about the different kinds of vocabulary that is used in the arts for different mediums, ethnic cultures, communities and age groups. These differences create communication difficulties between interested parties that desire to advance promising practices. Several respondents believed that there needs to be more public awareness about the relationship between arts and learning. Such awareness is lacking in the general public, business and school communities.

Policy Issues. Several policy-related concerns emerged with regard to this question. The most prominent issue raised concerned funding for arts and education programs. More assistance is needed with connecting said programs with individuals and institutions willing to invest in arts and education. Training is needed on fundraising and development strategies to support the arts.

Several respondents reported on problems associated with the lack of mission, goal, and value development around partnerships in the arts. According to one respondent, “… often these partnerships develop the mission
and goals while trying to implement the program.” Another respondent reported that “...people often misinterpret the meaning of partnership or assume from the outset that everyone agrees what a partnership is.”

High staff turnover was cited a frequent problem. Such turnover was linked to the lack of money or low pay available for artists. In this regard, “...despite our success-we find ourselves constantly having to start all over by training new staff and acclimating new staff to our organization.”

What promising practices will you be taking away from this conference and how do you hope to use them personally or in your organization?

Several respondents reported that the conference encouraged them to value the idea of assessment and critical self-reflection. According to one respondent, “...in the day-to-day operation of our work we often do not have the luxury to think about what we are doing – the conference made me realize (again) the importance of this.” Other respondents reported on their desire to engage in some kind of evaluative strategies about the programs they are providing in relation to the needs and desires of the communities they serve.

For many, the conference demonstrated and reinforced the importance of “networking in the field” and to avoid staying isolated. Finally, there was significant interest in advancing programs from a more “inclusive” perspective. Many believed they would return to their communities with a renewed interest in ensuring that their program efforts included wide scale community input.

What difficulties do you face personally and in your organization in trying to implement promising practices?

The lack of sufficient funding was cited as the most prevalent problem with effort to implement promising practices. This was followed by a lack of understanding and the need for technical assistance on program assessment and marketing. In line with what was previously reported, “high staff turnover” was frequently cited as a major difficulty.

CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS?

The networking and opportunities to share program successes and challenges with colleagues was the most valued highlight.

The conference was refreshing to many who attended because “...this was not a dog and pony show – many were sincere about the difficulties they faced in program development and survival” according to one respondent.

The chief criticism of the conference related to the work of the facilitators. Several attendees reported that the facilitators were too dominant and did not allow enough time for discussion and interaction between participants. The next major concern centered on the conference format. Several respondents believed that the format was too repetitive. These respondents generally believed that multiple strategies should have been employed to implement the conference in order to avoid monotony.

If you were a coordinator what would you have done differently?

Three themes emerged repeatedly with this question: Use better facilitators. One respondent captured the sentiment of a number of respondents “...they (facilitators) appeared to act as if they wanted us to discuss issues but in reality would not facilitate discussion in a way they allowed open discussion of the issues – they set-up false expectations.” The next most frequently cited issue concerned the schedule. Many believed that it was “too rushed – more time needed to be set aside for informal social events.” Also, that future conferences should be promoted as think tank events as opposed to seminars largely because a think tank approach indicates “...your goal is to solicit our opinions as experts as opposed to being lectured to about what our opinions should be.”

Bruce Jones
Project Evaluator
National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts

Partners in Excellence Initiative

Request for Proposals

The National Guild of Community Schools of Arts seeks exemplary partnerships for a national initiative to identify and study the most effective practices in K-12 arts education partnerships. Partners in Excellence is made possible through the generous support of the Josephine Bay Paul and C. Michael Paul Foundation.

WHAT: Up to twenty partnership projects will be selected for presentation at a national summit to take place in New York City on January 19-20, 2001, and inclusion in the subsequent publication of the summit proceedings. Ideas and materials generated at the summit will become the basis for a training institute, to be held during the summer of 2001. The emphasis at both the summit and the institute will be on process (how goals were achieved), rather than product (description of program). Selected presenters will receive an honorarium of $500 plus travel reimbursement of up to $500.

WHY: To foster the replication of best practices through dissemination and training.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE: You are encouraged to apply if:
• Yours is a continuous partnership of three or more years’ duration, in which children have a regular schedule of instruction by artists throughout the school year
• One of the partners is a public school
• Your institution is a 501(c)(3) organization or is a division of an umbrella organization such as a college, museum, orchestra, etc.
• An evaluation process is in place
• The program is truly a collaborative and coordinated effort, as opposed to a service-provider model

SELECTION PROCESS:
Proposals will be reviewed by an independent panel. In making its selection, the panel will consider the following factors, among others:
  Quality, scope, sustainability, shared goals and values of the partners, success in achieving those goals, leadership and commitment at all levels, ongoing evaluation, effectiveness of problem-solving strategies and clarity of narrative.

IMPORTANT DATES:
Proposal deadline: Postmarked by August 1, 2000
Notification: September 15, 2000
Summit: January 19-20, 2001
Publication of proceedings: March 2001
Training Institute: Summer 2001

Please submit the original and three copies of the proposal plus one set of optional support materials to:

National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts
Attn: Jacqueline S. Guttman, Project Director
40 North Van Brunt Street, PO Box 8018
Englewood, NJ 07631
Inquiries: 201-871-3337; E-mail: jguttman@carroll.com
APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS
Applications must be in a type size of 10 pt. or larger with margins of 1”. Please do not exceed two (2) pages for Part B and three (3) pages for each section in Part C. Please be as concise as possible.

PART A – ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE ON THIS FORM OR ON A PHOTOCOPY.)

________________________________________________________________________________________
Name of applicant organization

________________________________________________________________________________________
Name of contact person                                              Title

________________________________________________________________________________________
Street address

________________________________________________________________________________________
City                                                                                   State         Zip
Telephone                                Fax
E-mail                                      Website

Type of organization (please check all that apply):

  community arts school ____  performing arts group ____  arts center ____
  museum ____  other (please specify) __________________________________________

If your institution is a division of a larger umbrella organization, please provide the name of that Organization ________________________________________________________________________

A brief description of your organization, including history and current programs. (Please enclose a current catalog or informational brochure, if available.)
Part B – Summary Information (Maximum Two Pages)

1. Name(s) of partnering organization(s), contact people, telephone numbers

2. Brief description of partnership, including:
   - Number of students and grade levels served
   - History of the partnership: How did it come about and how has it evolved over time?
   - Goals and purposes
   - Evidence of institutional commitment among all the partners; embedding of the partnering concept as a “key value” within each organization
   - Strategies for weathering change in terms of community need, human resources, and institutional growth
   - Current annual budget; plans for continuation of programs after expiration of current funding

Part C - Narrative (Maximum Three Pages per Section)
You may apply under one or more of the following four sections, selecting the one(s) you feel are indicative of your greatest accomplishments. For each section please limit your response to three pages. Please be candid about any challenging situations you have encountered, and how such challenges have been met. Additional optional support materials may be included, e.g. videotapes, assessment instruments, sample partnership agreements, or teaching materials for professional development. In writing your narrative, please address the points listed for each section.

1. Ecology of the Partnership
   - Interrelationships among the partnering organizations; the project’s mission, structure and impact on the community
   - Evolution of the partnership, including the development of shared goals, the role of each partner, and the planning process and implementation
   - Roles and responsibilities regarding ongoing maintenance of the partnership
   - Please include a critical analysis describing the accomplishments, challenges and changes implemented as a result of lessons learned

2. Quality of teaching and learning
   - Instructional strategies and curricula for the program
   - Artist and teacher selection process and criteria
   - Maintaining the integrity of arts disciplines; what kind of arts learning takes place? what is the relationship between the arts and the school curriculum?
   - Adherence to national, state and local standards
   - Please include a critical analysis describing accomplishments, challenges and changes implemented as a result of lessons learned, as well as examples of curriculum materials and student work

3. Program evaluation and assessment of student learning
   - Design of the assessment/evaluation instrument and methodology employed
   - Indicators of success, both internal and external
   - Demonstration of outcomes regarding students (“primary” beneficiaries) and adults, e.g. teachers, parents, staff (“secondary” beneficiaries)
   - Utilization of assessment results
   - Please include a critical analysis describing accomplishments, challenges and changes implemented as a result of lessons learned

4. Professional development for teachers and artists
   - Professional development components and continuing education opportunities; participation incentives
   - Who are the participants: grade-level teachers, arts specialists, artists, administrators?
   - Qualifications of the professional development leaders
   - Professional development methods and materials; evidence of application in the classroom
   - Please include a critical analysis describing accomplishments, challenges and changes implemented as a result of lessons learned
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